

all in the State of Wisconsin, against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. M. Capps & Co., of Stevens Point, Wis., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Leisure Hour Art Club, of Oshkosh; Consumers' League; Woman's Club of Stevens Point, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring bill for federal bureau for children—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of Stevens Point (Wis.) Lodge, No. 64, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an appropriation to create a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the protection of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DUREY: Petition of various residents of the Twenty-fifth New York Congressional District, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Twentieth Century Club, of La Crosse, Wis., favoring the establishment of a children's bureau—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of citizens of Osseo, Wis., favoring parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Watertown locals, Nos. 4 and 6, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against reduction of duty on paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Elmer Stein and other citizens of Wisconsin, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Thorpe, Wis., against reduction of the duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Neillsville and citizens of Cash-ton and vicinity, all in the State of Wisconsin, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of Morton H. McAllister and other citizens of Vermont, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for federal aid in construction and improvement of highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Leitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bradford Weise Company, Rockford, Ill., against increase of duty on foreign hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Business Men's Association of South Norwalk, Conn., against reduction of tariff on news print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward and John Burke (Limited), relative to modification of tariff on bottled malt liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petitions of W. C. Pugh, L. R. Grabill, and C. G. Gehmin, all of Lancaster, Pa., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of citizens of Powers Lake and citizens of Traill County, all in the State of North Dakota, against reduction of duty on grains—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of citizens of Enfield, Me., against removal of duty on pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of J. H. Van Tain, William Powers, H. D. Wright, M. L. Lewellen, F. R. Gonzales, G. A. Beard, A. L. Starks, Harry R. Lawrence, L. M. Allen, Patrick Doherty, E. T. Rowe, R. E. Frost, E. A. Hafely, O. McCoy, William J. Juarez, J. E. Harmon, M. Mathison, George W. Smith, Frank Prowse, Theodore Perry, J. F. Knight, Ernest Miller, James Haunn, Joseph La Gara, Alfred Laplace, W. O. Miller, and 88 others, of San Jose, Cal., and August Rubin and 92 others, of Milpitas, Cal., favoring an effective exclusion law against all Asiatics, excepting merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of California, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of San Francisco (Cal.) Lodge, No. 3, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring the preservation of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Isaac Gallup Greer, Ledyard, Conn., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Business Men's Association of South Norwalk, Conn., against any reduction of duty on paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Paper to accompany bill for

relief of John D. Tidrick, previously referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Braid Manufacturers' Association, relative to tariff on braids—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Lakewood, N. J., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petitions of R. B. McReynolds, of Gerlaw; R. W. Brooks, of New Windsor, and other citizens of Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petitions of Transcript Printing Company; Anker Printing Company; Leahy Printing Company; M. J. Doyle Printing Company, all of Holyoke, Mass., against printing business addresses on envelopes sold by the Government—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Forada, Minn., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: Petition of Nebraska City Lodge, No. 1049, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Rev. W. S. Harris, of Harrisburg, for a commission to investigate claim of Theodore R. Tunley as the inventor of the revolving turret on the *Monitor* and other ships—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Charles Knickerbocker and 8 others, of Clio, Mich., favoring a constitutional amendment allowing women to vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of John Thomas and other North Carolina merchants, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of H. E. Rameur & Son, of Lincoln County; Morris Brothers and other merchants of Gaston County; Charles E. Barker and other merchants of Mecklenburg County; J. E. Suttle Company and other merchants of Cleveland County, all in the State of North Carolina, against parcels-post and postal savings bank legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of citizens of Clyman, Wis., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Allenton, Wis., against reduction of duty on farm products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, favoring an increase of the duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, March 22, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

AUGUSTUS O. BACON, a Senator from the State of Georgia, JOHN H. BANKHEAD, a Senator from the State of Alabama, ALEXANDER S. CLAY, a Senator from the State of Georgia, and JOHN WALTER SMITH, a Senator from the State of Maryland, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

### STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I submit a privileged resolution, and I ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Sixty-first Congress:

*On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.*—Messrs. Money, chairman, Stone, Cullom, Nelson, and Wetmore.

*On Agriculture and Forestry.*—Messrs. Dolliver, chairman, Warren, Burnham, Perkins, Burkett, Guggenheim, Page, John-

son of North Dakota, Money, Bankhead, Gore, Chamberlain, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Appropriations.*—Messrs. Hale, chairman, Perkins, Warren, Gallinger, Elkins, Kean, Burkett, Curtis, Tillman, Daniel, Clay, Foster, and Culberson.

*To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.*—Messrs. Kean, chairman, Gamble, Flint, Money, and Clarke of Arkansas.

*On Canadian Relations.*—Messrs. Smith of Michigan, chairman, Cummins, Burton, Root, Jones, Tillman, Foster, Gore, and Smith of Maryland.

*On the Census.*—Messrs. La Follette, chairman, Hale, McCumber, Carter, Guggenheim, Cummins, Bradley, McEnery, Taliaferro, Bailey, and Shively.

*On Civil Service and Retrenchment.*—Messrs. Cummins, chairman, Perkins, La Follette, Lodge, —, McLaurin, Clarke of Arkansas, Rayner, and Owen.

*On Claims.*—Messrs. Burnham, chairman, Kean, Smoot, Stephenson, Richardson, Page, Crawford, Bristow, Oliver, Martin, Overman, Frazier, Davis, and Paynter.

*On Coast and Insular Survey.*—Messrs. Piles, chairman, Richardson, Frye, Cullom, Wetmore, Clay, Culberson, Davis, and Bankhead.

*On Coast Defenses.*—Messrs. Nixon, chairman, du Pont, Bourne, Crane, Root, Jones, Taliaferro, Clay, Simmons, Foster, and Smith of Maryland.

*On Commerce.*—Messrs. Frye, chairman, Elkins, Nelson, Gallinger, Penrose, Depew, Perkins, Piles, Smith of Michigan, Bourne, Burton, Martin, Stone, Simmons, McLaurin, Clarke of Arkansas, and Newlands.

*On Conservation of National Resources.*—Messrs. Dixon, chairman, Clark of Wyoming, Beveridge, Dolliver, Dillingham, Heyburn, Dick, Briggs, Guggenheim, Jones, Newlands, Overman, Davis, Bankhead, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.*—Messrs. Taliaferro, chairman, Shively, Brown, La Follette, and Jones.

*On Cuban Relations.*—Messrs. Sutherland, chairman, Burnham, Clapp, Beveridge, Bulkeley, Curtis, Taliaferro, Simmons, Newlands, and Stone.

*On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.*—Messrs. Simmons, chairman, Frazier, and Gallinger.

*On the District of Columbia.*—Messrs. Gallinger, chairman, Dillingham, Scott, Gamble, Burkett, Carter, Bulkeley, Bradley, Martin, Paynter, Johnston of Alabama, Smith of Maryland, and Fletcher.

*On Education and Labor.*—Messrs. Borah, chairman, Dolliver, Penrose, Flint, Brandegee, Daniel, Rayner, Bankhead, and Shively.

*On Engrossed Bills.*—Messrs. Bacon, chairman, Lodge, and Burton.

*On Enrolled Bills.*—Messrs. Gamble, chairman, Stephenson, and Foster.

*To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.*—Messrs. Richardson, chairman, Warner, Page, Crawford, Culberson, Simmons, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.*—Messrs. Stephenson, chairman, Depew, Page, Simmons, and Gore.

*On Expenditures in the Interior Department.*—Messrs. Crawford, chairman, Burrows, McCumber, Davis, and Chamberlain.

*On Expenditures in the Department of Justice.*—Messrs. Bradley, chairman, Brown, Burnham, Bailey, and Rayner.

*On Expenditures in the Navy Department.*—Messrs. —, chairman, Borah, Dillingham, Martin, and Tillman.

*On Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.*—Messrs. Bristow, chairman, Smith of Michigan, Johnson of North Dakota, Bacon, and Frazier.

*On Expenditures in the Department of State.*—Messrs. Root, chairman, Warren, La Follette, McLaurin, and Stone.

*On Expenditures in the Treasury Department.*—Messrs. Burton, chairman, Briggs, —, Clarke of Arkansas, and Smith of Maryland.

*On Expenditures in the War Department.*—Messrs. du Pont, chairman, Cullom, Cummins, Money, and Foster.

*On Finance.*—Messrs. Aldrich, chairman, Burrows, Penrose, Hale, Cullom, Lodge, McCumber, Smoot, Flint, Daniel, Money, Bailey, Taliaferro, and Simmons.

*On Fisheries.*—Messrs. Bourne, chairman, Perkins, Bulkeley, Briggs, Jones, McEnery, Bailey, Overman, and Fletcher.

*On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.*—Messrs. Tillman, chairman, Fletcher, Clapp, Curtis, and Johnson of North Dakota.

*On Foreign Relations.*—Messrs. Cullom, chairman, Frye,

Lodge, Clark of Wyoming, Kean, Beveridge, Carter, Smith of Michigan, Root, Bacon, Money, Frazier, Stone, and Shively.

*On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.*—Messrs. Brandegee, chairman, Depew, Perkins, Burnham, Smoot, Lodge, Tillman, Overman, and Taylor.

*On the Geological Survey.*—Messrs. Briggs, chairman, Elkins, Burkett, Sutherland, Money, Rayner, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Immigration.*—Messrs. Dillingham, chairman, Lodge, Penrose, Heyburn, La Follette, Briggs, Brown, Richardson, McLaurin, Davis, Gore, Hughes, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Indian Affairs.*—Messrs. Clapp, chairman, McCumber, Gamble, Sutherland, La Follette, Curtis, Brown, Dixon, Page, Stone, Davis, Paynter, Owen, Bankhead, and Hughes.

*On Indian Depredations.*—Messrs. Curtis, chairman, Dick, Dixon, Stephenson, Crawford, Oliver, Martin, McLaurin, Davis, Johnston of Alabama, and Owen.

*On Industrial Expositions.*—Messrs. Jones, chairman, Crane, Stephenson, Page, Johnson of North Dakota, Crawford, Oliver, Daniel, Rayner, Overman, Taylor, Bankhead, and Paynter.

*On Interoceanic Canals.*—Messrs. Flint, chairman, McCumber, Brandegee, Dolliver, Dick, Borah, Richardson, Crawford, Bristow, Taliaferro, Simmons, Johnston of Alabama, Smith of Maryland, and Hughes.

*On Interstate Commerce.*—Messrs. Elkins, chairman, Cullom, Aldrich, Kean, Clapp, Crane, Nixon, Cummins, Tillman, McLaurin, Foster, Newlands, and Taylor.

*To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.*—Messrs. Johnson of North Dakota, chairman, Bradley, and Paynter.

*On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.*—Messrs. Carter, chairman, Warren, Flint, Nixon, Sutherland, Borah, Briggs, Jones, Bailey, Newlands, Gore, Smith of Maryland, and Chamberlain.

*Joint Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the United States.*—Messrs. Heyburn, chairman, Sutherland, Piles, McLaurin, and Clarke of Arkansas.

*On the Judiciary.*—Messrs. Clark of Wyoming, chairman, Nelson, Depew, Dillingham, Sutherland, Piles, Warner, Brandegee, Borah, Bacon, Culberson, Clarke of Arkansas, Overman, Rayner, and Paynter.

*On the Library.*—Messrs. Wetmore, chairman, Briggs, Cummins, Root, Burton, Daniel, Newlands, and Shively.

*On Manufactures.*—Messrs. Heyburn, chairman, Gallinger, Oliver, —, Clay, Frazier, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Military Affairs.*—Messrs. Warren, chairman, Scott, Bulkeley, Warner, du Pont, Dick, Dixon, Briggs, Brown, Taliaferro, Foster, Overman, Frazier, Johnston of Alabama.

*On Mines and Mining.*—Messrs. Dick, chairman, Scott, Heyburn, Nixon, Sutherland, Guggenheim, Tillman, Johnston of Alabama, Gore, and Hughes.

*On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.*—Messrs. Warner, chairman, Dolliver, Brown, Burton, McEnery, McLaurin, and Owen.

*On Naval Affairs.*—Messrs. Perkins, chairman, Hale, Penrose, Gallinger, Burrows, Wetmore, Clapp, Tillman, Martin, McEnery, and Smith of Maryland.

*On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.*—Messrs. Depew, chairman, Clapp, Flint, Piles, Warner, Richardson, —, Rayner, Clarke of Arkansas, Owen, and Fletcher.

*On Pacific Railroads.*—Messrs. Burkett, chairman, Frye, Smith of Michigan, Stephenson, Guggenheim, Taliaferro, Gore, Chamberlain, and Shively.

*On Patents.*—Messrs. Brown, chairman, Clapp, Brandegee, —, Foster, Shively, and Smith of South Carolina.

*On Pensions.*—Messrs. McCumber, chairman, Scott, Burnham, Smoot, Piles, La Follette, Curtis, du Pont, Taliaferro, Taylor, Gore, Hughes, and Shively.

*On the Philippines.*—Messrs. Lodge, chairman, Beveridge, Burrows, Dick, Nixon, Brandegee, Heyburn, du Pont, Guggenheim, Johnston of Alabama, Paynter, Chamberlain, Fletcher, and Hughes.

*On Post-Offices and Post-Roads.*—Messrs. Penrose, chairman, Dolliver, Burrows, Scott, Crane, Carter, Dick, Bourne, Guggenheim, Clay, Taliaferro, Owen, Bankhead, and Taylor.

*On Printing.*—Messrs. Smoot, chairman, Elkins, Gallinger, Richardson, Bourne, Smith of Maryland, Chamberlain, and Fletcher.

*On Private Land Claims.*—Messrs. Daniel, chairman, McEnery, Davis, Kean, Smith of Michigan, Oliver, and —.

*On Privileges and Elections.*—Messrs. Burrows, chairman, Depew, Beveridge, Dillingham, Dolliver, Gamble, Heyburn, Bulkeley, Bailey, Frazier, Paynter, Johnston of Alabama, and Fletcher.



*On Public Buildings and Grounds.*—Messrs. Scott, chairman, Warren, Heyburn, Warner, Wetmore, Gamble, Bulkeley, du Pont, Stephenson, Culberson, Clay, Stone, Overman, Taylor, and Gore.

*On Public Expenditures.*—The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, acting chairman; the chairman of the Committee on Finance; the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads; the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs; Messrs. Nelson, Gamble, Crane, Carter, Bourne, Cummins, Burton, Root, McLaurin, Newlands, Owen, Fletcher, and Hughes.

*On Public Health and National Quarantine.*—Messrs. Martin, chairman, McEnery, Culberson, Fletcher, Depew, du Pont, Bourne, Smoot, Bristow, and Crawford.

*On Public Lands.*—Messrs. Nelson, chairman, Clark of Wyoming, Gamble, Smoot, Flint, Heyburn, Dixon, Jones, Johnson of North Dakota, McEnery, Newlands, Davis, Owen, Bankhead, and Chamberlain.

*On Railroads.*—Messrs. Bulkeley, chairman, Clark of Wyoming, Nelson, Bourne, du Pont, Bristow, Oliver, Bacon, Money, Taylor, and Bankhead.

*On Revolutionary Claims.*—Messrs. Bailey, chairman, Bradley, and Root.

*On Rules.*—Messrs. Crane, chairman, Aldrich, Elkins, Warren, Carter, Bacon, Bailey, and Clarke of Arkansas.

*On Standards, Weights, and Measures.*—Messrs. Page, chairman, Borah, Bristow, Bacon, and Hughes.

*On Territories.*—Messrs. Beveridge, chairman, Dillingham, Nelson, Burnham, Kean, Dick, Piles, Clarke of Arkansas, Frazier, Owen, and Hughes.

*On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.*—Messrs. Oliver, chairman, Clark of Wyoming, Warner, Bristow, —, Daniel, Rayner, Gore, and Bankhead.

*On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.*—Messrs. McEnery, chairman, Stone, Clark of Wyoming, Nixon, and Bradley.

*On the University of the United States.*—Messrs. Guggenheim, chairman, Frye, Dillingham, Curtis, Wetmore, Dixon, Oliver, Clay, Foster, Overman, and Taylor.

*On Woman Suffrage.*—Messrs. Clay, chairman, Johnston of Alabama, Beveridge, Burkett, and Wetmore.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee on committees will at a later date submit a joint resolution increasing the number of members upon the joint committees on the Library and on Printing. The membership is now fixed by law at a smaller number than under the resolution just adopted by the Senate.

The committee will also at a later date bring in a resolution fixing the powers and duties of the new Committee on Public Expenditures, which the Senate has just created.

Mr. BACON. If I understood the Senator from Rhode Island correctly, he spoke of a committee on committees. I should like to inquire if there is a Senate committee of that style now organized?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think not. Perhaps I should have said that I, as a Senator, would present the resolutions.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 27 as passed by the legislature of 1909 and all indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 16th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

S. C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

By E. A. PLATTS,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 27.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to create in the War and Navy departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "civil-war soldiers' roll."

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully petitioned to amend the bill now pend-

ing in the Senate to create in the War and Navy departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "civil-war soldiers' roll," so as to create a roll to be known as the "civil-war soldiers' roll," and that all soldiers and sailors of the civil war who served with credit for one or more years during the civil war be carried upon such roll, and that all soldiers and sailors carried upon such roll now living be granted pay at the rate of \$1 per day during the remainder of their lives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 9 as passed by the legislature of 1909 and all indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 18th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

S. C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

By E. A. PLATTS,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution memorializing Congress to refuse revenue licenses for the sale of intoxicants to be used as a beverage in States and portions thereof where laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors are in force.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to enact laws providing that no license to sell intoxicating liquors as a beverage be issued by the United States for revenue tax or any other purpose in any State or portion thereof where laws prohibiting traffic in intoxicating liquors are in force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 1, as passed by the legislature of 1909, and all indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 18th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

S. C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

By E. A. PLATTS,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

A joint resolution on waterways.

Be it resolved by the senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That whereas the subject of improvement by the Federal Government of internal waterways of the United States for purposes of navigation, and the promotion of commerce thereby, is a vital issue before the whole people; and

Whereas the policy of such improvement and promotion is one which has been emphatically indorsed by most if not all political parties and by the statesmen and representatives of said parties; and

Whereas said policy arose out of the necessity for larger facilities for prompt, universal, and cheapened carriage of the subjects of commerce, which policy demands, to those ends, the greatly enlarged use of natural waterways as well as the building of artificial waterways in various localities; and

Whereas such improvement of waterways is for the benefit of the people everywhere, and to inland towns as well as those located on waterways; and

Whereas there exist in the more westerly sections of the country and elsewhere various organizations created and in active operation for the purpose of promoting the above-stated ends, one of which organizations, more particularly devoted to bringing about the systematic improvement of the Missouri River on both its upper and lower reaches, for the purpose of navigation and greatly increasing the facilities of operating boats thereon in trade and commerce, is the Missouri River Navigation Congress, and the purposes of said organization are of great interest and benefit to the people of the Missouri Valley at large, including the State of South Dakota: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State of South Dakota is vitally interested in, and hereby, through her legislature, heartily indorses the issue and the policy of improvement of internal waterways throughout the United States, including the Missouri River and its navigable tributaries, the building of the deep waterways canal from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico, and the deepening of the channel of the lower Missouri River and the Mississippi to render such canal more practicable and useful for large lines of commerce of the West and South, and the systematic improvement of the upper Missouri as part of such general process, thereby bringing the seaboard, east and south, practically much nearer the Missouri Valley and to South Dakota producers, merchants, and consumers, which improvements will result in materially cheapening and accelerating the carriage of commodities in this State and the Northwest at large, and of increasing the value of our products in the markets of the world.

Resolved, That the State of South Dakota and her citizens will encourage in all proper ways the work of the Missouri River Navigation Congress and will heartily aid in making the first annual convention of said organization, to be held in Yankton in June, 1909, a success; that

we appreciate the honor conferred upon Yankton and this State by said organization in selecting said city as the place of holding said convention.

*Resolved*, That South Dakota, as one of the upper Missouri Valley States among the seven States represented by said Missouri River Navigation Congress, sends greeting to each and all of the other States represented in said organization, and asks their united cooperation in common with South Dakota—whose cooperation is hereby pledged in the promotion of the purposes of said organization and of the affiliated organizations in the West and South; that we favor an intelligent and comprehensive plan of improvement of the Missouri River and other commercial waterways, and a faithful and economical expenditure of moneys by the Federal Government to those ends and pursuant to such plans.

*Resolved*, That we urgently request the South Dakota delegation in Congress to cooperate in bringing about, by the present and the next Congress, such reasonable appropriations for internal waterways improvement for purposes of navigation, including the Missouri River and her navigable tributaries, as will be adequate to effectuate substantial progress in such improvements as soon in future as proper plans for such outlay can be adopted.

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby instructed to transmit copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 18 as passed by the legislature of 1909, and all indorsements thereon, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre, this 16th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

S. C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.  
By E. A. PLATTS,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 18.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to remove the tariff on lumber. *Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring)*:

Whereas the forests of the United States are being rapidly consumed and the day is not far distant when we will be dependent wholly on importation for our lumber supply; and

Whereas the lumber supply of the United States is now entirely owned and controlled by the most arrogant and grasping of all of the commercial combinations: Therefore,

*Resolved*, That the legislature of the State of South Dakota hereby does petition the Congress of the United States to remove the tariff upon lumber to the end that foreign lumber may be encouraged to come into our markets and at the same time the power of the lumber trust to oppress the public be to some extent limited.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 34, as passed by the legislature of 1909, and all indorsements thereon, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 18th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

S. C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.  
By E. A. PLATTS,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 34.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to provide for the return of discharged soldiers and sailors from the Battle Mountain Sanitarium at Hot Springs, S. Dak., to their homes:

*Be it resolved by the house of representatives of South Dakota (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully petitioned to provide that soldiers and sailors discharged from the Battle Mountain Sanitarium at Hot Springs, S. Dak., be returned to their homes and not left a charge upon the community where the sanitarium is located.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a concurrent resolution of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution 2.

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States of America a certain bill introduced by Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, Hon. J. K. KALANIAN'AOLE, which, if passed by said Congress, will confer upon the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii the power and right to amend and repeal the public-land laws of Hawaii; and

Whereas it is the expressed wish of the people of this Territory that the legislature may in the near future acquire by act of Congress the power and right to legislate for the regulation and disposition of the public lands: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That we hereby indorse the principle of said bill and do hereby urge and recommend that Congress act favorably upon said bill as soon as may be, believing that the final passage of said bill will promote a broader development of the industrial pursuits and interests of this Territory; and be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of the following persons: The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Delegate to Congress.

*Resolved further*, That the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii be, and he is hereby, requested to act for and on behalf of the legislature in the transmission of certified copies of this resolution.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
Honolulu, E. H., March 1, 1909.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives.  
EDWARD WOODWARD,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
Honolulu, E. H., March 1, 1909.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

WILLIAM O. SMITH,  
President of the Senate.  
WILLIAM SAVIDGE,  
Clerk of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the Territorial Bank of Agriculture of Porto Rico, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for certain changes in the tariff which affect the products of that Territory, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association, of South Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Congress Club, of Kings County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for certain changes in the monetary system of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the usurpation of the constitutional right of freedom of speech and of the press, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Kitching Post, No. 60, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Yonkers, N. Y., praying that an appropriation be made for the raising of the wreck of the battle ship *Maine*, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Fathers and Mothers' Club, of Boston, Mass., praying for the establishment of a children's bureau in the Interior Department, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Aeronautic Society of New York City, N. Y., praying that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made to enable the Signal Corps to carry on experiments in aeronautics, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Branch, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Watertown, N. Y., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on print paper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Box Manufacturers, praying for an increase of the tariff on lumber to at least \$3 per thousand feet, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Juan, P. R., praying for a protective duty on coffee, sugar, and tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Certificate of certified copy.)

STATE OF IDAHO,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert Lansdon, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 8, by Parsons, which was filed in this office the 8th day of March, A. D. 1909, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 8th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT LANSDON,  
Secretary of State.



House joint memorial 8. By Mr. Parsons.

To the Senate and House of Representatives  
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent—

That the county of Idaho, in the State of Idaho, contains in total 7,213,490 acres of land, of which 911,165 are surveyed lands, and that the remaining acreage of the county of Idaho is absorbed by the national forest reserves and contains 5,036,430 acres; that the rentals of and from these reserves in the year 1906 (the last report obtainable) amounted to but \$1,729.90.

That within the boundaries of these reserves there are not less than 25 mining camps, in more or less conditions of real and bona fide stages of development, and that there is now in this county of Idaho not less than 20 stamp mills of from 2 to 30 stamp capacity.

That from the eastern terminus of the Clearwater branch of the Northern Pacific Railroad, at the town of Stites, Idaho, in the county of Idaho, to the mining camps of Newsome, Elk City, Dixie, Orogrande, Buffalo Hump, and Concord there is but one wagon road to the camps above mentioned, and that this wagon road passes over three heavily timbered mountain ranges of high elevation, and that said wagon road is at times almost, and at other times wholly, impassable for the mail, passenger, and freight traffic, to which uses it was intended to serve, and that the conditions as above described prevail for long periods of time in the seasons of fall, winter, and spring, thereby causing great delay in the transporting of mail, passengers, and freight, and keeping up the cost of production of living, and for freight rates, retarding the progress of that part of the county of Idaho to such an extent as to almost prohibit development along any lines of investment.

That during the first eleven months of the year 1908 Idaho County produced \$119,389.91 in metal value, practically all gold, the above-mentioned camps having produced the greater portion of the total.

That a good wagon road to the within-mentioned camps from the city of Grangeville—the county seat of Idaho County and now the terminus of the Lapwai branch of the Northern Pacific Railroad—would be of inestimable value to not alone the mining, but to the agriculture, grazing, timber, and postal service as well.

That a wagon road could be constructed on practically a water grade, and avoiding the high ranges in the heavy-timbered and snow-covered route, as is now the only manner of reaching the camps herein mentioned, if the following-described route is considered, viz:

Commencing at Grangeville; thence in an easterly direction, by way of Mount Idaho, the Dewey mine, and "The Cove," to the South Fork of the Clearwater River; thence up the said South Fork of the Clearwater River to Fourmile Creek; thence diverging into two branches, one of which would extend on up the South Fork of the Clearwater River to the Elk Basin via the American River grade, and the other branch would extend on up the Fourmile Creek to the mining camps of Orogrande, Buffalo Hump, and Dixie, thereby opening up a vast scope of country not now available to postal routes or for grazing or agriculture and mining purposes.

That the distance and the time essence of the interests involved would be greatly lessened by the above route, and the Nation, State, and county would be benefited to an extent beyond any practical doubt of the project.

That the distance covering the proposed route would be 75 miles, and that a reasonable estimate of the cost to construct said wagon road as contemplated would be not more than \$75,000, and that this expenditure would be the means of opening up one of the most promising resources of wealth in the northwestern part of the United States of America.

And your memorialists further represent that said county of Idaho is compelled to exercise police power and maintain criminal jurisdiction over the immense national forest reserves of 5,036,430 acres, being larger in extent than the combined States of Rhode Island, Delaware, and Connecticut, and the only revenue of the said Idaho County receives from the forest-reserve department is 10 per cent of the rentals of said reserve lands, which is not sufficient to cover the cost of a single criminal case originating in the above-mentioned reserves.

We therefore pray that the sum of \$75,000 may be appropriated by the honorable House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States for the surveying, construction, and building of a wagon road, as herein set forth, and that there may be provided a suitable commission or board, by appointment, to superintend such construction and building of said wagon road.

That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward to the Senate, the House of Representatives of the United States, and to our Representatives in Congress copies of this memorial.

This house joint memorial No. 8 passed the house of representatives on the 6th day of March, 1909.

PAUL CLAGSTONE,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial No. 8 passed the senate on the 6th day of March, 1909.

L. H. SWEETSER,  
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 8 originated in the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Idaho during the tenth session.

JAMES H. WALLIS,  
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Certificate of certified copy.)

STATE OF IDAHO,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert Lansdon, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 1, by Whitaker, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, which was filed in this office the 9th day of March, A. D. 1909, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 10th day of March A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT LANSDON,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1. By Mr. Whitaker.

To the Senate and House of Representatives  
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that:

Whereas a bill is now pending in the Senate of the United States providing for the granting of a right of way to the Panhandle Electric Railway and Power Company, with necessary station and terminal grounds, through a portion of the Kniska National Forest Reserve, in Bonner County, State of Idaho; therefore

Your memorialist, the legislature of the State of Idaho, earnestly recommends the passage of said bill, and represents that the construction and building of said railway will be of vast importance and great public benefit to the northern portion of the State of Idaho, opening up numerous and valuable mines which now have ready for shipment many tons of ore, which, at the present time, is valueless for lack of transportation; also placing a vast amount of timber and timber products in reach of available markets; will aid and assist many settlers who are now residing upon and are improving and cultivating valuable agricultural lands, in reaching ready markets and disposing of their product at reasonable profit.

The national forest will also be greatly benefited by the passage of said bill in placing all their surplus products within the national forest in close touch with the outside world.

Your memorialist therefore earnestly recommends the passage of said bill, in order that there may be no delay in securing this great and additional improvement to northern Idaho.

The secretary of state is hereby requested to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Representatives in Congress from this State.

I hereby certify that the above senate joint memorial No. 1 originated in the senate during the tenth session of the legislature of the State of Idaho.

F. A. SHAW,  
Secretary of the Senate.

The above senate joint memorial No. 1 passed the senate on the — day of February, 1909.

L. H. SWEETSER,  
President of the Senate.

The above senate joint memorial No. 1 passed the house of representatives on the — day of March, 1909.

PAUL CLAGSTONE,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a memorial of the legislature of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Certificate of certified copy.)

STATE OF IDAHO,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert Lansdon, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 7, by Riblett, Patch, Adams, and Storey, which was filed in this office the 6th day of March, A. D. 1909, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 8th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT LANSDON,  
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 7. By Messrs. Riblett, Patch, Adams, and Storey.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives  
of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent: That

Whereas under the reclamation act, as it now provides, the settlers on the government projects, reclaimed under said act, are greatly hampered and inconvenienced and the development of such tracts greatly retarded by the long period required in said act in which to perfect title to such land;

Now, therefore, your memorialists do ever pray that the reclamation act be so amended as to allow commutation as provided in the homestead act, and to provide that at the expiration of five years from the date of entry, or after commutation, the entryman may, upon filing with the proper officer an affidavit to the effect that he has complied with all the provisions of the act up to the time of making such affidavit, receive a certificate vesting in him a conditional fee which will entitle him to sell, transfer, or convey to any person or persons all his rights, title, and interest in the land covered by his entry, subject, however, to be defeated by failure of the entryman, his heirs, executors, or assigns to pay to the Government the water apportionments as provided in said act; And be it

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward this memorial to the Congress of the United States, and copies thereof to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house joint memorial No. 7 passed the house of representatives on the 5th day of February, 1909.

PAUL CLAGSTONE,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial No. 7 passed the senate on the 5th day of March, 1909.

L. H. SWEETSER,  
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 7 originated in the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Idaho during the tenth session.

JAMES H. WALLIS,  
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of the Union Veteran Republican Club, of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a per diem pension to the soldiers of the civil war, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 739, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Plattsmouth, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., remonstrating against the imposition of any duty on tea and coffee, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 294, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Fairmont, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Institute, of French Creek, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called "Davis bill" providing for the establishment of agricultural and industrial high schools, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dawson, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a volunteer retired list in the War and Navy departments for the surviving officers of the civil war, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Towanda, Pa., and Louisville, Ky., praying that an appropriation be made to place an appropriate memorial to the memory of James Rumsey in Statuary Hall in the Capitol building at Washington, D. C., which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. NELSON presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. Thorpe.

Whereas the details of the "denatured-alcohol" law recently enacted by the last Congress are under the supervision of the Internal Revenue Commissioner; and

Whereas the present law requires a fee of \$20 on every worm in use for the purpose of extracting spirits from the different products; and

Whereas this would apply to individual consumers' stills with a daily capacity of from 5 to 25 gallons in the manufacture of "industrial alcohol" for house consumption:

*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of Minnesota,* That the \$20 tax on worms for "individual stills" is an unnecessary and prohibitive tax and to a certain extent prohibits the intents and purposes for which the "industrial-alcohol" law was enacted, and that we hereby request the Internal Revenue Commissioner to exempt the individual consumers' stills from this unnecessary tax;

*Resolved further,* That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to our Representatives in Washington and to the President of the United States by the secretary of the senate, asking their support in this important matter.

Mr. NELSON presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution.

Whereas there is a general demand by the people of the United States and of the people of the State of Minnesota for better and more permanent public roads: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate of the State of Minnesota (the house concurring),* That it is the sense of the people of this State that owing to the increase in population, the increase of the products of the farm seeking a market in reciprocal exchanges for manufactured articles, the increased wealth of our country, coupled with the extension of the rural free-delivery mail carrier service of the General Government, which is now recognized as a fixed and permanent policy of the Federal Government, furnishes sound reason why the General Government should aid in the improvement of the public highways of the several States and Territories, and the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to extend some such aid by the appropriation of a percentage of the cost of such permanently improved main highways throughout the different States and Territories of the Union where and whenever a State and the several counties thereof shall by statute extend a like aid in so improving their main highways, under such conditions and restrictions as may be by said Congress determined upon and deemed advisable: Be it further

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the people of the State of Minnesota that any annual appropriation of at least \$50,000,000 for a long term of years would do more to advance the betterment of the whole people of the United States than would the expenditure of a like amount of money for any other purpose: Be it also further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

Mr. NELSON presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Weis offered the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas it is concurrently reported that an effort will be made either at the approaching special or the Sixty-second Congress to secure the enactment of a graduated inheritance-tax bill as a source of revenue for the National Treasury; and

Whereas Minnesota is one of 33 of the States of the Union which now has a graduated inheritance-tax law which has been sustained by

the courts, after many repeated trials, and has produced a revenue to the state treasury since its enactment and up to August 1, 1908, of \$365,882; and

Whereas the Minnesota inheritance law has become an established principle of law and administration in this State and produces a certain revenue without imposing any great hardship upon those taxed under its provisions; and

Whereas the scientific tax associations of the country are unanimous in their view that an inheritance tax is a function properly imposed by the State and by the State alone; Now therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate of the State of Minnesota (the house concurring),* That it is the sense of the people of this State that the National Congress refrain from the taxation of inheritances for federal purposes and to reserve this source of revenue for the exclusive use of the several States.

This legislature therefore respectfully requests and urges the several Senators and Representatives representing the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States to support a properly drawn joint memorial, when proposed for adoption by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring it to be the policy of the Federal Government to refrain from the taxation of inheritances for federal purposes.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 516, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of St. Cloud, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Staples, Minn., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers and General Merchants' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the repeal of the duty on tea and coffee, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Hardware Association of Minnesota, praying for the repeal of the duty on individual stills used in the manufacture of denatured alcohol, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of Local Lodges Nos. 652, 1073, 171, 906, 646, 613, 901, 888, 966, 1002, of Eureka, Redding, Oakland, Santa Monica, Santa Rosa, Santa Barbara, Petaluma, Long Beach, San Pedro, and Berkeley, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of San Jose, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the immigration of all Asiatics into the United States except merchants, students, and travelers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DICK presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hannibal, Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of the Fireman's Fund Insurance Company, of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, N. Y., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Queens-Nassau Medical Society, of Glen Cove, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national bureau of public health in the Department of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Williams-ville, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Albion, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings bank" bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Middleburg and New York City, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings banks bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Standard Varnish Works, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of



adulterated, misbranded, or falsely graded naval stores, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Jewelers' Board of Trade, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the national bankruptcy law, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Eureka Fire Hose Manufacturing Company, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a system of national wagon roads in the Territory of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and Mount Vernon, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "children's bureau bill," which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the memorial of James P. Hayes, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to declare the intent of certain provisions of the coastwise laws, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Troy, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Nelson bankruptcy bill," relating to voluntary bankruptcy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Joseph Wild & Co., of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national court of patent appeals in Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 247, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Schenectady, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of any system of piecework in the navy-yards of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the New York Chamber of Commerce, praying for the enactment of legislation to acquire sites and buildings in foreign countries for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Williamson Fruit Growers' Association, of Williamson, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a uniform national and state law governing the manufacture and sale of insecticides and fungicides, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Newlands bill," providing for the erection of the Lincoln memorial on the Mall west of the Washington Monument, Washington, D. C., which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of Chapin Post, No. 2, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Brig. Gen. Henry W. Lawton, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a memorial of New York Division, Sons of Veterans, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., remonstrating against any appropriation being made for the purpose of erecting monuments to the memory of men who were connected with the confederate army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the New York Chapter, American Institute of Architects, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to create in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury a bureau of arts and public buildings, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of Luyties Brothers, of New York City, praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the proposed tariff bill to encourage the sale and importation of articles of domestic manufacture, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of C. W. Snow & Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., remonstrating against any change being made in the basis of assessing dutiable values from the present basis of current market values in the country of export to the selling price in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and Long Island City, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oneida, Hudson, Buffalo, Oswego, and Troy, all in the State of New York, praying for the repeal of the duty on Canadian barley, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Dean Alvord Company, of New York City, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on lead and zinc ores, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Wool Sorters' Union No. 349, American Federation of Labor, of Lawrence, Mass., remonstrating against any reduction being made in the duty on textile goods, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodges Nos. 364, 141, 841, 767, 744, 1039, and 748, of Hornell, Schenectady, Troy, Staten Island, Oneida, Peekskill, Owego, and Cortland, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of the Alabama Marble Company, of New York City, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on marble, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Schenectady and Albion, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "Burkett-Foelker" bill to prohibit the interstate telegraphing of race-gambling bets, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation governing the operation of motor vehicles within the District of Columbia and the Territories while engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 367, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Nicholls bill" relative to the military establishments of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for a modification of the present duty on oilcloth and linoleum, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 5. By Senator Ruth.

Whereas the daily papers are authority for the report that the aged mother of Capt. Charles Gridley, who commanded the cruiser *Olympia* at the battle of Manila, must toil for her daily bread at the age of 83; and

Whereas, the cruiser *Olympia* fired the first shot in that illustrious battle which gave the command of the great Pacific Ocean to the United States, thereby forever associating our state capitol with the noble captain who responded with such effect to Admiral Dewey's laconic command, "You may fire when ready, Gridley;" Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Washington (the house concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be urged to secure for this aged woman, Mrs. Ann Gridley, an adequate pension to solace her declining years.

Passed by the senate February 26, 1909.

A. S. RUTH,  
President of the Senate.

Passed by the house February 27, 1909.

LEO. O. MEIGS,  
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Sam H. Nichols, secretary of state of the State of Washington, and keeper of the seal thereof, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 7, of legislative session of 1909, has been compared by me with the original enrolled copy of said resolution now on file in this department, and that the same is a true copy thereof and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State, at the capitol, in the city of Olympia, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAM H. NICHOLS,  
Secretary of State.

## House joint memorial 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives  
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that,

Whereas the American elk, formerly so plentiful in the United States and other sections of North America, is rapidly diminishing in numbers and will become entirely extinct within a few years unless the National Government takes some immediate steps for the preservation of the species; and

Whereas at the present time no suitable reserve has been established by the National Government for such purpose: And now therefore be it

*Resolved by the house and senate of the State of Washington,* That the Congress of the United States pass such legislation as is now before it creating a reserve for the American elk in the State of Wyoming, and making a suitable appropriation for that purpose; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Washington for their use in endeavoring to secure the passage of such legislation.

Passed by the house February 26, 1909.

Passed by the senate March 2, 1909.

Mr. JONES presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Senate concurrent resolution 17. By Senator Metcalf.

Whereas it appears from the investigation made by the Senate of the United States and otherwise that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the same under federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate of the State of Washington (the house concurring),* That application be, and the same is hereby, made to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

*Resolved further,* That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of the said body representing this State therein.

Passed the senate February 2, 1909.

A. S. RUTH,  
President of the Senate.

Passed the house February 24, 1909.

LEO. O. MEIGS,  
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES presented memorials of sundry citizens of Washington remonstrating against any reduction being made in the duty on lumber, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution providing that the legislature institute measures leading to repairs of the Portage levee.

Whereas a part of the levee along the north bank of the Wisconsin River at Portage, to wit, about 3½ miles of the lower part of such levee, locally known as the "government levee," is in urgent need of immediate repairs; and

Whereas this part of the levee was built by the General Government in 1888, and maintained by the General Government until about 1900, since which time no repairs have been made; and

Whereas it is generally understood that the General Government still holds the right of way and has the legal control of this part of the levee, thus preventing the State, county, or local authorities from repairing or exercising control over the same; and

Whereas these facts were set forth in a report made by a committee of this legislature, which report appears in the journals of senate and assembly under date of June 24, 1907, and the same facts are now further confirmed by a communication from the state levee commission, consisting of three citizens of Portage, acting under state authority, which communication is in part as follows:

"The undersigned state levee commissioners respectfully inform you that the Wisconsin River, since the inspection made by the legislative committee in 1907, has washed off all of the bank for a distance of nearly 300 feet and even slightly undermined the government levee at some places, which make repairs absolutely necessary to prevent a break." Such state commission further says: "We are firm and right in our belief, in which the whole community shares, that the government levee is a necessary protection to the government canal leading from the Wisconsin River to the Fox, as well as the improvements in the Fox River in aid of navigation, both of which works have been done by the General Government at large expense, and to protect which this levee was originally built; the damage done to the canal by the levee break of 1900 being in direct support of this contention;" and

Whereas not alone the important government works above mentioned need the protection of this levee, but the safety of several thousand of our citizens who have homes in the district that will be overflowed in case of a break in the government levee, as well as private property valued at several millions of dollars, and to a great extent, all of the cities and villages, the vast manufacturing and farming interests along the upper Fox River above Lake Winnebago: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the foregoing facts be immediately brought to the attention of the Wisconsin Members of Congress; and further

*Resolved,* That the legislature urgently requests that measures be promptly instituted leading to the repair, by the General Government, of that part of the Portage levee herein referred to—such repairs being imperative and conditions will not admit of delay; and further

*Resolved,* That if any question exists as to the legal ownership of the right of way and the right of supervision of this so-called "government levee" that the necessary investigation be made to determine such ownership, but that the needed repairs be not delayed during such investigation.

JOHN STRANGE,  
President of the Senate.  
F. E. ANDREWS,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.  
L. H. BANCROFT,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Appleton, Little Chute, Park Falls, Marinette, Eau Claire, and Crivitz, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on print paper, wood pulp, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the William Lawrence Shoe Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., and a petition of sundry citizens of Madison, Wis., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the imposition of just and higher duties on imported lithographs to equalize the conditions existing between the importer and the domestic producer, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Boyd, Wis., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on barley and other grains, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Omro, Osseo, and Ellison Bay, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodges Nos. 864, 259, 402, and 410, of Beloit, Green Bay, Eau Claire, and Madison, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. PILES presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all whom these presents shall come:

I, Sam H. Nichols, secretary of state of the State of Washington and keeper of the seal thereof, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 7 of session of 1909 has been compared by me with the original enrolled copy of said resolution now on file in this department and that the same is a true copy thereof, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State at the capitol, in the city of Olympia, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.] SAM H. NICHOLS,  
Secretary of State.

## House joint memorial 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives  
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that,

Whereas the American elk, formerly so plentiful in the United States and other sections of North America, is rapidly diminishing in numbers and will become entirely extinct within a few years unless the National Government takes some immediate steps for the preservation of the species; and

Whereas at the present time no suitable reserve has been established by the National Government for such purposes: And now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house and senate of the State of Washington,* That the Congress of the United States pass such legislation as is now before it, creating a reserve for the American elk in the State of Wyoming, and making a suitable appropriation for that purpose; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Washington for their use in endeavoring to secure the passage of such legislation.

Passed by the house February 26, 1909.

Passed by the senate March 2, 1909.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of South Dakota:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 29 as



passed by the legislature of 1909 together with all indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 4th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 29.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to establish hospitals for the examination of intending immigrants at the principal European ports of embarkation.

*Be it enacted by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring).* That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully petitioned to establish at the chief European ports of embarkation hospitals under the direction of expert American physicians for the physical examination of intending immigrants to America, to the end that the hardships incident to examinations and the refusal of the authorities to admit immigrants at the American ports, by reason of which families are broken up and submitted to great distress, may be averted.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota:*

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 23, as passed by the legislature of 1909, together with all indorsements thereon, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 4th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 23.

A joint resolution memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact laws giving the Interstate Commerce Commission power and authority to fix maximum rates of express charges and otherwise to supervise, regulate, and control express companies.

*Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):*

SECTION 1. Whereas under the present system there is no adequate power controlling the state and interstate business of express companies; and

Whereas the express charges in many instances are exorbitant: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That we do hereby urge and request the Congress of the United States by proper enactment to authorize and command the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the maximum rates of express charges and otherwise to supervise, regulate, and control the express companies.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota:*

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 22, as passed by the legislature of 1909, together with all indorsements thereon, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 4th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 22.

A joint resolution requesting Congress to set aside a township of land in the Bad Lands of South Dakota for a national park.

Whereas there is a small section of country about the headwaters of the White River in South Dakota where nature has carved the surface of the earth into most unique and interesting forms and has exposed therein the geological formations to an extent perhaps not elsewhere found; and

Whereas this formation is so unique, picturesque, and valuable for the purpose of study that a portion of it should be retained in its native state: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring),* That Congress be, and hereby is, requested to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall select a township of government land in the most picturesque portion of the region mentioned and the same shall be set aside and be kept as a national park.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota:*

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 28,

as passed by the legislature of 1909, together with all indorsements thereon, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 4th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 28.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to sink experimental artesian wells on arid and semiarid lands.

*Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring).* That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to provide for sinking a number of experimental artesian wells upon arid and semiarid public lands in the several States which are remote from streams of running water.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota:*

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 15 as passed by the legislature of 1909, together with all indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 4th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,  
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 15.

A joint resolution and memorial, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass an act granting unto the State of South Dakota 62,029.40 acres of land in lieu of a like amount of land heretofore granted to said State for the support of the common schools of said State, and which said land so heretofore granted has been appropriated by the Government of the United States for public reservations and which is included in the public reservation known as the "Black Hills" and the "Sioux" national forests, and permitting the State of South Dakota to make lieu selections out of any public lands within the said State of South Dakota which are now being opened to settlement.

*Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):*

SECTION 1. Whereas by an act of Congress passed and approved on the 22d day of February, 1889, there was granted unto the State of South Dakota for the support of the common schools all of sections 16 and 36 in every township within the State; and

Whereas by act of Congress of March 3, 1891, and acts amendatory thereto power was vested in the President of the United States to set apart and reserve in any State or Territory having public land bearing forests, wholly or in part covered with timber or undergrowth, as public reservations; and

Whereas the President of the United States by proclamation has set apart and reserved for the purposes before mentioned public reservations including lands in Custer, Lawrence, Meade, Pennington, and Butte counties, S. Dak.; and

Whereas there was included within said reservations so set apart 62,029.40 acres of school lands of the State of South Dakota; and

Whereas the said State of South Dakota by virtue of the creation of said reservations is largely deprived of said lands; and

Whereas the State of South Dakota is desirous of relinquishing any claim which it has or should have in or to any of the school lands which the said State has or should have had within said reservations, and of securing from the Congress of the United States an act permitting it to select lieu lands out of any public lands which are now being opened to settlement in said State within the Standing Rock and Cheyenne River Indian reservations prior to the opening of such lands to homestead entry in place of the said school lands so included within said reservations: Be it therefore

*Resolved,* That we do hereby earnestly urge the Congress of the United States by proper enactment to authorize the said State of South Dakota to select out of any unappropriated lands which are now being opened to settlement within said Indian reservations in said State 62,029.40 acres of land for the support of common schools of said State in lieu of the same amount of land appropriated by the Government of the United States in the establishment of the Black Hills and Sioux national forests; be it further

*Resolved,* That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to employ their best efforts to accomplish this end during the present session of Congress, or during the special session which may convene soon after the adjournment of the present session.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the New England Dry Goods Association, remonstrating against the proposed increase in the duty on hosiery and gloves, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the quarterly meeting of Friends, of Vassalboro, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry lithographers employed in the State of Maine, praying for an increase in the duty on lithographic products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## EMPLOYMENT OF CLERKS AND MESSENGERS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 5), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution 5.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Conservation of National Resources and the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department be, and they are hereby, each authorized to employ a clerk at the rate of \$2,220 per annum and a messenger at the rate of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

## EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGERS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 6), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution 6.

*Resolved*, That the resolutions of February 5, 1902, and January 4, 1906, authorizing the employment of messengers to the following committees, viz: On Revision of the Laws of the United States, To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington, and On National Banks, be, and the same are hereby, repealed from and after the passage of this resolution.

## PRINTING OF TARIFF BILL, ETC.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution 5 from the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 5.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the two Houses 30,000 copies of the bill of the House (H. R. 1438) entitled "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," with an index thereto, and the same number of the report thereon, 25,000 copies of said report to be accompanied with the views of the minority, all in document form, 9,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 21,000 copies for the use of the House.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 1) authorizing the purchase of grounds for the accommodation of public buildings for the use of the Government of the United States in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2) to establish land courts of the United States and an appellate land court of the United States, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands:

A bill (S. 4) providing the manner of making payments for water rights under reclamation act of June 17, 1902; and

A bill (S. 5) providing for the reappraisal of unsold lots in town sites on reclamation projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

A bill (S. 6) providing for the establishment at the seat of government of a department of mines; and

A bill (S. 7) to validate the location of mineral claims heretofore made by United States deputy mineral surveyors during their incumbency in office.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 8) to reimburse the States and Territories for sections 16 and 36 when taken for forest or other government reserves;

A bill (S. 9) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; and

A bill (S. 10) to modify the boundary lines of the Priest River National Forest in Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 11) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 12) providing for the deposit of a model of any vessel of war of the United States Navy, bearing the name of a State of the United States, in the capitol building of said State, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 13) to amend the military record of John J. Muehleisen;

A bill (S. 14) to amend the military record of Edward B. Metz; and

A bill (S. 15) to amend the military record of Jonas O. Johnson.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 16) to prevent fraudulent representations as to government guaranties of foods and medicines, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 17) granting an increase of pension to Moses Ashenfelter, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 18) granting a pension to Maria H. Amsden;

A bill (S. 19) granting a pension to Anthony L. Bledsoe, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 20) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Butt;

A bill (S. 21) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Camp;

A bill (S. 22) granting an increase of pension to David Chapman, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 23) granting an increase of pension to John A. Chretien;

A bill (S. 24) granting an increase of pension to Martha Clark;

A bill (S. 25) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Conklin, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 26) granting an increase of pension to John D. Elliott;

A bill (S. 27) granting a pension to Emma Felch;

A bill (S. 28) granting a pension to Jethro J. T. Garde;

A bill (S. 29) granting an increase of pension to Dewitt C. Gardner, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 30) granting an increase of pension to John Hays;

A bill (S. 31) granting a pension to Thomas Heady;

A bill (S. 32) granting an increase of pension to Simon Jensen;

A bill (S. 33) granting an increase of pension to David Jewell;

A bill (S. 34) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Kinney;

A bill (S. 35) granting an increase of pension to Leander McGrew;

A bill (S. 36) granting an increase of pension to Robert Moore, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 37) granting an increase of pension to Allen D. Mourer, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 38) granting a pension to William L. Naftzger, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Passage, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 40) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Platt;

A bill (S. 41) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Powers, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 42) granting an increase of pension to John W. Rogers, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 43) granting an increase of pension to Max Reidel, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 44) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Roe, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 45) granting an increase of pension to Michael Savage;

A bill (S. 46) granting an increase of pension to David D. Sullivan, with an accompanying paper;

A bill (S. 47) granting an increase of pension to John Todd;

A bill (S. 48) granting an increase of pension to Eri C. Tuller;

A bill (S. 49) granting an increase of pension to James R. Vassar;

A bill (S. 50) granting an increase of pension to James K. Watts;



A bill (S. 51) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler, with accompanying papers; and

A bill (S. 52) granting an increase of pension to Edward Woolring, with accompanying papers.

Mr. SCOTT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 53) granting a pension to William M. Pomroy;

A bill (S. 54) granting a pension to John R. Clegg, with an accompanying paper;

A bill (S. 55) granting an increase of pension to John S. Kenney;

A bill (S. 56) granting an increase of pension to William S. Holland, with the accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 57) granting an increase of pension to Peter Vandye;

A bill (S. 58) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Cain;

A bill (S. 59) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Harper;

A bill (S. 60) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Smith;

A bill (S. 61) granting an increase of pension to William P. Lovejoy;

A bill (S. 62) granting a pension to Cemantha Hyer;

A bill (S. 63) granting an increase of pension to Henry Newhouse;

A bill (S. 64) granting a pension to Joshua I. Cooksey;

A bill (S. 65) granting pensions to volunteer army nurses of the civil war;

A bill (S. 66) for the relief of Capt. Isaac Alt's company (B), Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 67) for the relief of Capt. John Bogg's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 68) for the relief of Capt. John Bond's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 69) for the relief of Capt. Sampson Snyder's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 70) granting a pension to H. Heasley;

A bill (S. 71) granting a pension to John B. Garvey;

A bill (S. 72) granting a pension to Cora C. O'Neill;

A bill (S. 73) granting an increase of pension to William E. Cornwell;

A bill (S. 74) granting an increase of pension to John H. Crumbaugh;

A bill (S. 75) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Harless;

A bill (S. 76) granting an increase of pension to James H. McGill;

A bill (S. 77) granting pensions to officers and enlisted men of the military and naval service of the United States who served ninety days or more during the war of the rebellion, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 78) granting an increase of pension to H. H. Michael;

A bill (S. 79) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bachus;

A bill (S. 80) granting an increase of pension to Carr Nicholas; and

A bill (S. 81) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Insko.

Mr. SCOTT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 82) for the relief of the estate of Philip Null, deceased;

A bill (S. 83) for the relief of the estate of John Burns, deceased;

A bill (S. 84) for the relief of Oakley Randall;

A bill (S. 85) for the relief of the heirs of William A. Griffin, deceased;

A bill (S. 86) for the relief of the heirs of James E. Pyne, deceased;

A bill (S. 87) for the relief of William H. West;

A bill (S. 88) for the relief of William D. Graham;

A bill (S. 89) for the relief of the estate of James R. D. Morrison, deceased;

A bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Custer, deceased;

A bill (S. 91) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Dinkle, heirs of John F. Dinkle, and J. Daniel Dinkle;

A bill (S. 92) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased;

A bill (S. 93) for the relief of Jessie W. Graham, sole heir of Jesse Graham, deceased;

A bill (S. 94) for the relief of the estate of Henry Gannon, deceased;

A bill (S. 95) for the relief of the estate of James H. Hardesty, deceased;

A bill (S. 96) for the relief of the estate of Levi Moler, deceased;

A bill (S. 97) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Ridenour, deceased;

A bill (S. 98) for the relief of the heirs of Harmon Snyder, deceased;

A bill (S. 99) for the relief of the estate of James Watson, deceased;

A bill (S. 100) for the relief of George A. Davis, administrator of Mrs. Martha N. Davis, deceased;

A bill (S. 101) for the relief of the estate of Jacob J. Foreman, deceased;

A bill (S. 102) for the relief of George A. Davis, administrator of Patrick Brady, deceased;

A bill (S. 103) for the relief of R. S. Gillilan, executrix of the estate of M. B. Gillilan; and

A bill (S. 104) for the relief of George W. Board.

Mr. SCOTT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 105) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew C. Boyd;

A bill (S. 106) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Solomon M. Bennett;

A bill (S. 107) for the relief of Stephen A. West;

A bill (S. 108) to correct the military record of David N. Kinkead;

A bill (S. 109) to bring about the gradual readjustment of rank throughout the several lines of the artillery, cavalry, and infantry of the Regular Army;

A bill (S. 110) (by request) to correct the inequalities of promotion in the army caused by the one-time system of regimental promotion; and

A bill (S. 111) to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 112) to limit the jurisdiction of certain judges appointed under the authority of the United States, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 113) to amend section 3165 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to revenue officers who may administer oaths and take evidence, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 114) taxing real estate in the District of Columbia at the true value thereof, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 115) for the relief of Marcellus Troxell, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

He also introduced a bill (S. 116) to tax certain deposits with national banking associations, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 117) authorizing the issuance of bonds to erect public buildings in cities of 5,000 or more population, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

A bill (S. 118) to repeal acts heretofore passed relating to alienation of the title of the United States to land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 119) to provide for ascertaining the interest or title of the United States in any land or water rights in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 120) for the relief of Capt. E. C. Harper's company (A), Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 121) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 122) to provide for the inspection of immigrants to the United States, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 123) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war, the war with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war;" and

A bill (S. 124) to provide for placing ex-Presidents of the United States on the retired list as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States, and to provide for an annuity for the widows of Presidents and ex-Presidents.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 125) to provide for the payment of installments due on contracts or land entries made under the provisions of an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 126) to confirm and legalize prior admissions to citizenship of the United States where the judge or clerk of the court administering the oath to the applicant or his witnesses has failed to sign or seal the record, oath, or the judgment of admission, and to establish a proper record of such citizenship, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

A bill (S. 127) to establish an agricultural plant, shrub, and tree experimental station at or near the city of Mandan, west of the Missouri River, in the State of North Dakota; and

A bill (S. 128) to establish an agricultural experiment station at or near the city of Williston, in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 129) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 130) to establish a fish-culture station at the city of Fargo, in the State of North Dakota, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 131) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wahpeton, N. Dak.; and

A bill (S. 132) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Jamestown, N. Dak.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 133) to provide for the incorporation, control, and government of associations organized to carry on business entering into or becoming a part of interstate commerce, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 134) establishing rate of pay for rural free carriers, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BROWN introduced a bill (S. 135) to amend section 3224 of the United States Compiled Statutes so as to prevent the restraining of the assessment or collection of any tax, state, county, municipal, district, or federal, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 136) to amend an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BURROWS introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to Byron R. Pierce, with the accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to William D. Kilgour;

A bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to William F. Rodgers;

A bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Grace M. Hunt;

A bill (S. 141) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lewis;

A bill (S. 142) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Wilbur;

A bill (S. 143) granting an increase of pension to William Gaunt;

A bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to George W. Edson;

A bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to James W. Smith;

A bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Davis;

A bill (S. 147) granting a pension to Ann Stearns;

A bill (S. 148) granting an increase of pension to Wait B. Steenberg;

A bill (S. 149) granting a pension to Margaret Barry;

A bill (S. 150) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Randall; and

A bill (S. 151) granting an increase of pension to John W. Angell.

Mr. TAYLOR introduced a bill (S. 152) to improve the Cumberland River, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 153) to erect an addition to the post-office and court-house building in the city of Jackson, State of Tennessee, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 154) to authorize the construction of a national road from the city of Nashville, Tenn., to The Hermitage, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 155) requiring railroads and other common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to make prompt acknowledgment and adjustment of claims for overcharge on freight, and for loss and injury to same, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 156) for the relief of T. J. Murphy; and

A bill (S. 157) for the relief of George T. Larkin.

Mr. TAYLOR introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 158) granting an increase of pension to James F. Campbell;

A bill (S. 159) granting a pension to Georgia B. Snapp;

A bill (S. 160) granting an increase of pension to A. F. Broyles;

A bill (S. 161) granting an increase of pension to Prior P. Baird;

A bill (S. 162) to grant pensions to the East Tennessee bridge burners;

A bill (S. 163) granting a pension to Mary E. Simerly;

A bill (S. 164) granting an increase of pension to John G. Burchfield;

A bill (S. 165) granting a pension to Henry Jones;

A bill (S. 166) granting an increase of pension to Lottie J. Lewis;

A bill (S. 167) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Moore;

A bill (S. 168) granting a pension to Derris Gregg;

A bill (S. 169) granting a pension to Elihu Messer;

A bill (S. 170) granting an increase of pension to A. Bornstein;

A bill (S. 171) granting a pension to Michael Grace;

A bill (S. 172) granting a pension to A. C. Donnelly;

A bill (S. 173) granting an increase of pension to Jesse H. Patterson;

A bill (S. 174) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett;

A bill (S. 175) granting a pension to John H. Smith; and

A bill (S. 176) granting a pension to Elza Houston.

Mr. PAYNTER introduced a bill (S. 177) to fix the price of gas in the District of Columbia, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FLETCHER introduced a bill (S. 178) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Abraham Collinsworth, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 179) to provide for the distribution of the reports of the United States circuit courts of



appeals and of the United States circuit and district courts to certain officers of the United States, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 180) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 181) granting to the State of South Dakota a certain amount of land in lieu of a like amount of land heretofore granted to the State and subsequently appropriated by the United States for forest reservation purposes, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 182) regulating the settlement of the accounts between the United States and the several States relative to the disposition of the public lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 183) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 184) authorizing the purchase of additional lands for the Fort Meade Military Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation therefor, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 185) to establish mining experiment stations, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 186) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Brookings, S. Dak.;

A bill (S. 187) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Rapid City, S. Dak.;

A bill (S. 188) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Madison, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (S. 189) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Canton, in the State of South Dakota; and

A bill (S. 190) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Vermillion, in the State of South Dakota.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands:

A bill (S. 191) to amend an act approved February 24, 1905, for the protection of persons furnishing labor, materials, plant, and supplies for the construction of public works; and

A bill (S. 192) for the relief of the First National Bank of Bellefourche, S. Dak.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 193) for the relief of James D. Elliott; and

A bill (S. 194) for the relief of Isaac Bettelyoun.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 195) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Benkert, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 196) granting a pension to Sarah M. Trousdale;

A bill (S. 197) granting an increase of pension to Perry Fellers;

A bill (S. 198) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Stevens;

A bill (S. 199) granting an increase of pension to William H. Maxwell;

A bill (S. 200) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Parker, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 201) granting an increase of pension to Lynus J. Kibbe, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 202) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Knight, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 203) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Fearon, with accompanying papers; and

A bill (S. 204) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hough, with an accompanying paper;

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 205) granting a pension to Hannah A. J. Cooper;

A bill (S. 206) granting a pension to Sarah D. Drew;

A bill (S. 207) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Baker;

A bill (S. 208) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Blood;

A bill (S. 209) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Boardman;

A bill (S. 210) granting an increase of pension to Lillia Q. Brackett;

A bill (S. 211) granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane;

A bill (S. 212) granting an increase of pension to William Cody;

A bill (S. 213) granting an increase of pension to Horatio J. Collins;

A bill (S. 214) granting an increase of pension to John W. Currier; and

A bill (S. 215) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Doying.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 216) for the relief of Wells C. McCool;

A bill (S. 217) for the relief of Mary C. Burgess; and

A bill (S. 218) for the relief of Leander Gerrard and Edward A. Gerrard.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 219) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Nebraska, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 220) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Falls City, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 221) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Westpoint, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 222) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Wayne, State of Nebraska; and

A bill (S. 223) providing for the procuring of additional land for the site of the public building at Beatrice, Nebr.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 224) providing for carrying free of postage in the mails reading matter for the use of the blind, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 225) to prevent the nullification of state anti-gambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or of racing odds;

A bill (S. 226) to amend an act entitled "An act to divide the judicial district of Nebraska into divisions and to provide for an additional district judge in said district;" and

A bill (S. 227) to amend section 720 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 228) to provide for macadamizing Fort Crook military boulevard from Fort Crook, Nebr., to the south city limits of South Omaha, Nebr., and appropriating money therefor;

A bill (S. 229) for the establishment of a general depot of the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army at Omaha, Nebr.;

A bill (S. 230) to increase the efficiency of the Signal Corps of the Army;

A bill (S. 231) to establish the true status of the First Regiment, Second Brigade, Nebraska Mounted Militia; and

A bill (S. 232) to establish the true status of the Nebraska Territorial Militia.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 233) to amend section 5239 of chapter 4 of title 62 of an act entitled "National banks," Revised Statutes of the United States, 1878, which

was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

A bill (S. 234) to regulate commerce;  
A bill (S. 235) to prevent discriminations in interstate telegraph and telephone rates and fixing requirements governing the receipt and preservation of such messages; and

A bill (S. 236) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers by railroad to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 237) to extend the provisions of the acts of June 27, 1890, and May 9, 1900, and February 6, 1907, regarding pensions, so as to include the officers and privates of Captain Stuft's independent company of Indian scouts, Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and the widows and minor children of such persons;

A bill (S. 238) granting a pension to Jerome De Vriendt;  
A bill (S. 239) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Upright;

A bill (S. 240) granting an increase of pension to George B. Smith;

A bill (S. 241) granting a pension to Jane Warren;  
A bill (S. 242) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mann;

A bill (S. 243) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Dodd;

A bill (S. 244) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Barker;

A bill (S. 245) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Brady;

A bill (S. 246) granting an increase of pension to Maud J. Clark;

A bill (S. 247) granting an increase of pension to Silas M. Clark;

A bill (S. 248) granting an increase of pension to Howard G. Cleaveland;

A bill (S. 249) granting an increase of pension to H. T. Coffman;

A bill (S. 250) granting an increase of pension to Ella R. Cooper;

A bill (S. 251) granting a pension to Joseph L. Cooper;

A bill (S. 252) granting an increase of pension to Thornton S. Crosley;

A bill (S. 253) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Crouch;

A bill (S. 254) granting an increase of pension to John Currie;

A bill (S. 255) granting an increase of pension to George W. Davenport;

A bill (S. 256) granting an increase of pension to Amos H. Denman;

A bill (S. 257) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Dodd;

A bill (S. 258) to pension Michael Evans without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension;

A bill (S. 259) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ferster;

A bill (S. 260) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fulton;

A bill (S. 261) granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Green;

A bill (S. 262) granting a pension to Mary Guinn;

A bill (S. 263) granting an increase of pension to John Hastings;

A bill (S. 264) granting an increase of pension to Peter Henkel;

A bill (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Hiner;

A bill (S. 266) granting an increase of pension to German L. Hunt;

A bill (S. 267) granting an increase of pension to W. L. Ireland;

A bill (S. 268) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson;

A bill (S. 269) granting an increase of pension to John Kemmer;

A bill (S. 270) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Lafin;

A bill (S. 271) granting an increase of pension to John H. Lennon;

A bill (S. 272) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mann;

A bill (S. 273) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mason;

A bill (S. 274) granting an increase of pension to William O'Brien;

A bill (S. 275) granting an increase of pension to William S. Peery;

A bill (S. 276) granting an increase of pension to Horace Perry;

A bill (S. 277) granting an increase of pension to Ichabod S. Prosser;

A bill (S. 278) granting a pension to A. G. Robinson;

A bill (S. 279) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Salsbury;

A bill (S. 280) granting an increase of pension to George D. Salyer;

A bill (S. 281) granting an increase of pension to William Sherman;

A bill (S. 282) granting a pension to Mildred E. Tigner;

A bill (S. 283) granting an increase of pension to Carah Van Matre;

A bill (S. 284) granting an increase of pension to Willard W. Wilkinson; and

A bill (S. 285) granting a pension to Anna A. Yule.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

A bill (S. 286) providing for the control of grazing upon the public lands in the arid States and Territories of the United States; and

A bill (S. 287) to provide for the advancement of instruction in agriculture, manual training, and home economics in the state normal schools of the United States.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 288) for the creation of the police and firemen's relief fund, to provide for the retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such retirement, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 289) for the relief of Sadie A. Lewis, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 290) to provide for the construction and equipment of a revenue cutter for service in Narragansett Bay and adjacent waters, to take the place of the revenue cutter *Dexter*, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 291) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 292) for the relief of George R. Frye; and

A bill (S. 293) for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan, Jeremiah McCarthy, and Bartholomew Shea, and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of John B. Dillon.

Mr. WETMORE introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 294) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Havens;

A bill (S. 295) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Weaver;

A bill (S. 296) granting an increase of pension to James McDonald;

A bill (S. 297) granting an increase of pension to John Galvin;

A bill (S. 298) granting an increase of pension to John H. Flier;

A bill (S. 299) granting an increase of pension to James Franklin Woodcock;

A bill (S. 300) granting an increase of pension to James K. Pritchard, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 301) granting an increase of pension to John A. Crowningshield, with accompanying papers; and

A bill (S. 302) granting an increase of pension to Augustus F. Snow, with accompanying papers;



Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 303) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Souder; and

A bill (S. 304) granting an increase of pension to Tyrus C. Dickinson.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I introduce a bill and ask that it may lie on the table.

The bill (S. 305) to regulate the issue of securities by transportation, telegraph and telephone companies engaged in interstate commerce, for the purpose of better protecting the people against unreasonable rates and charges was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will lie on the table at the request of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Andrus;

A bill (S. 307) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bachman;

A bill (S. 308) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Bass;

A bill (S. 309) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Bell;

A bill (S. 310) granting an increase of pension to William Baldwin;

A bill (S. 311) granting an increase of pension to James C. Betts;

A bill (S. 312) granting an increase of pension to Salem Bruner;

A bill (S. 313) granting an increase of pension to James C. Bullock;

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Susan C. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to David M. Caviness;

A bill (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to John Coburn;

A bill (S. 317) granting a pension to Orlando Collins;

A bill (S. 318) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus M. Cowger;

A bill (S. 319) granting a pension to Mary Dano;

A bill (S. 320) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Eck;

A bill (S. 321) granting an increase of pension to John Feehan;

A bill (S. 322) granting an increase of pension to James G. Flester;

A bill (S. 323) granting an increase of pension to Henry Fightmaster;

A bill (S. 324) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Fisher;

A bill (S. 325) granting an increase of pension to William H. Fisher;

A bill (S. 326) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Gard;

A bill (S. 327) granting a pension to Thomas Glynn;

A bill (S. 328) granting an increase of pension to John E. Gilmore;

A bill (S. 329) granting a pension to Anna E. Grages;

A bill (S. 330) granting a pension to Martha S. Grimes;

A bill (S. 331) granting an increase of pension to John M. Guthrie;

A bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Hart;

A bill (S. 333) granting an increase of pension to Ransom L. Harris;

A bill (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hime;

A bill (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to James E. Houghland;

A bill (S. 336) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hussey;

A bill (S. 337) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Kelley;

A bill (S. 338) granting an increase of pension to William S. Lackor;

A bill (S. 339) granting an increase of pension to Willis Lake;

A bill (S. 340) granting a pension to Millard F. Lash;

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Moses Lezer;

A bill (S. 342) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Linn;

A bill (S. 343) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McLarnan;

A bill (S. 344) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Mallo;

A bill (S. 345) granting an increase of pension to John Mosmer;

A bill (S. 346) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mingles;

A bill (S. 347) granting an increase of pension to Elias G. Moore;

A bill (S. 348) granting an increase of pension to James I. Moss;

A bill (S. 349) granting an increase of pension to Oliver F. Pettibone;

A bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to David S. Porter;

A bill (S. 351) granting a pension to Samuel H. Portz;

A bill (S. 352) granting an increase of pension to Loren G. Robinson;

A bill (S. 353) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Rose;

A bill (S. 354) granting an increase of pension to John M. Ryan;

A bill (S. 355) granting an increase of pension to Phil Schaller;

A bill (S. 356) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shannon;

A bill (S. 357) granting an increase of pension to David Sharp;

A bill (S. 358) granting an increase of pension to Duane E. Simons;

A bill (S. 359) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sims;

A bill (S. 360) granting an increase of pension to George O. Stedman;

A bill (S. 361) granting an increase of pension to Amos Stewart;

A bill (S. 362) granting a pension to Eliza Stone;

A bill (S. 363) granting an increase of pension to John C. Thompson;

A bill (S. 364) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Toops;

A bill (S. 365) granting an increase of pension to Rufus B. Tucker;

A bill (S. 366) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Vandel;

A bill (S. 367) granting a pension to Martha M. A. Whitcomb; and

A bill (S. 368) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams.

Mr. CURTIS introduced a bill (S. 369) authorizing national banking institutions to take advantage of guarantee bank-deposit laws in certain States, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DICK introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 370) granting a pension to Elise Lowe;

A bill (S. 371) granting a pension to Ethel M. Hoffman;

A bill (S. 372) granting a pension to Charles H. Jessee;

A bill (S. 373) granting a pension to Lizzie H. Voris;

A bill (S. 374) granting a pension to Helen L. Fitch;

A bill (S. 375) granting a pension to Susan E. Lime;

A bill (S. 376) granting a pension to Sophia M. Henry;

A bill (S. 377) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Hibbard;

A bill (S. 378) granting a pension to Virginia Yard;

A bill (S. 379) granting an increase of pension to Israel O. Gaskill;

A bill (S. 380) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Adams;

A bill (S. 381) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Taylor;

A bill (S. 382) granting an increase of pension to George Albright;

A bill (S. 383) granting an increase of pension to Timothy D. McGillicuddy;

A bill (S. 384) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah T. Houseman;

A bill (S. 385) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Hart;

A bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Ellanora M. Hollis;

A bill (S. 387) granting an increase of pension to Edward Everett Henry;

A bill (S. 388) granting an increase of pension to Dorcas Jones;

A bill (S. 389) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Freeman;

A bill (S. 390) granting an increase of pension to John Akerman;

A bill (S. 391) granting an increase of pension to Margaret W. Goodwin;

A bill (S. 392) granting an increase of pension to James H. Dickson;

A bill (S. 393) granting an increase of pension to William A. Mullen;

A bill (S. 394) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hoskins;

A bill (S. 395) granting an increase of pension to Eugene R. Eggleston;

A bill (S. 396) granting an increase of pension to Erwin F. Mason;

A bill (S. 397) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Forbriger; and

A bill (S. 398) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Reeves.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 399) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be erected a suitable building or buildings for marine-hospital purposes on the present marine-hospital site at San Francisco, Cal., and to remove all or any of the present structures on said site, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 400) for the relief of officers of the navy retired for disability incident to the service, employed on active duty; and

A bill (S. 401) directing that the charge of desertion standing against the name of George F. Stedman be removed.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 402) granting an increase of pension to John H. Edge, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BACON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 403) for the relief of John W. Boston, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama introduced a bill (S. 404) for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 405) authorizing the President to reinstate William T. Russell, jr., and Harry G. Weaver as cadets in the United States Military Academy, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 406) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended by an act approved February 5, 1903, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 407) granting an increase of pension to Miner A. Robbins;

A bill (S. 408) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Gladding;

A bill (S. 409) granting an increase of pension to George W. Rowley;

A bill (S. 410) granting a pension to Franklin H. Sage;

A bill (S. 411) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin M. Carroll;

A bill (S. 412) granting an increase of pension to Amos S. Hancox;

A bill (S. 413) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 414) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Lord;

A bill (S. 415) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bushnell;

A bill (S. 416) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Fish;

A bill (S. 417) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hill;

A bill (S. 418) granting a pension to Julius Ortman;

A bill (S. 419) granting an increase of pension to William S. Ely;

A bill (S. 420) granting a pension to Laura E. Hicks; and

A bill (S. 421) granting an increase of pension to Kate Gorham.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 422) to remove the charge of desertion against John White, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 423) to establish in the Department of the Interior a bureau to be known as the "children's bureau," which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 424) to authorize the Chuacawalla Development Company to build a dam across the Colorado River near Parker, Ariz.;

A bill (S. 425) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the city of Coronado and the Coronado Beach Company for protecting property from the encroachment of the Pacific Ocean;

A bill (S. 426) for the improvement of the harbor at San Diego, Cal.;

A bill (S. 427) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Cal.; and

A bill (S. 428) directing the Secretary of War to establish and operate a line of steamers along the Pacific coast, and making provision therefor.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 429) to divide the southern judicial district of California into three divisions and to provide for the holding of terms of court at the cities of Fresno, Los Angeles, and San Diego; and

A bill (S. 430) to provide for an additional district judge for the southern district of California.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 431) to reimburse the Southern Pacific Company the amounts expended by it from December 1, 1906, to November 30, 1907, in closing and controlling the break in the Colorado River;

A bill (S. 432) for the relief of Carlos Manjarrez; and

A bill (S. 433) for the relief of Ella Phillips, widow of David Phillips, deceased.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico:

A bill (S. 434) to ratify and confirm an act of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, authorizing the manufacture and distribution of electric light and power in the district of Wailuku, Territory of Hawaii;

A bill (S. 435) to ratify an act of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, authorizing the manufacture and distribution of electric light and power in the district of Lahaina, Territory of Hawaii;

A bill (S. 436) to confirm to the Wahiawa Water Company, of Hawaii, the right of way for irrigation purposes; and

A bill (S. 437) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

A bill (S. 438) to provide for the disposal of lands chiefly valuable for oil and asphaltum; and

A bill (S. 439) to establish an assay office at Los Angeles, State of California.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 440) to correct the military record of Lewis W. Crain; and

A bill (S. 441) to correct the military record of Paul Sinock.



Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 442) for the relief of the legal heirs of A. G. Strain, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 443) granting an increase of pension to John M. Spangler, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 444) granting an increase of pension to Edward Waltemeyer;

A bill (S. 445) granting an increase of pension to John A. Blak;

A bill (S. 446) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah J. Hannon;

A bill (S. 447) granting an increase of pension to Lyman A. Holcomb;

A bill (S. 448) granting an increase of pension to William Stein;

A bill (S. 449) granting a pension to Cora E. Ruttinger;

A bill (S. 450) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Winchester;

A bill (S. 451) granting an increase of pension to John Hopper;

A bill (S. 452) granting an increase of pension to Caspar Wilky;

A bill (S. 453) granting an increase of pension to William Murray;

A bill (S. 454) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Driesbach;

A bill (S. 455) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso L. Stacy;

A bill (S. 456) granting a pension to John T. Young;

A bill (S. 457) granting an increase of pension to James Congdon;

A bill (S. 458) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Ward Fitz-Gerald;

A bill (S. 459) granting an increase of pension to William M. Dunn;

A bill (S. 460) granting an increase of pension to James Walter Smith; and

A bill (S. 461) to increase the pensions of certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico.

Mr. PILES introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 462) granting an increase of pension to Josephus Hostler, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 463) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rogers;

A bill (S. 464) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Stevens;

A bill (S. 465) granting an increase of pension to William Deering;

A bill (S. 466) granting an increase of pension to Zaphna L. King;

A bill (S. 467) granting a pension to Francis R. Gorman;

A bill (S. 468) granting a pension to Elizabeth Agnes Plunkett;

A bill (S. 469) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thornberry;

A bill (S. 470) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Brown;

A bill (S. 471) granting arrears of pension to Pardon A. Morris;

A bill (S. 472) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gibson;

A bill (S. 473) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Foster;

A bill (S. 474) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shute;

A bill (S. 475) granting an increase of pension to David A. Craddock;

A bill (S. 476) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Ekstrand;

A bill (S. 477) granting an increase pension to Edward F. Parker;

A bill (S. 478) granting an increase of pension to August Brulot;

A bill (S. 479) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gifford;

A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Robert Stewart;

A bill (S. 481) granting an increase of pension to Fidella A. Boyd;

A bill (S. 482) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Taylor;

A bill (S. 483) granting an increase of pension to Marion L. Metcalf;

A bill (S. 484) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Kahls;

A bill (S. 485) granting an increase of pension to Augustus J. Moonert;

A bill (S. 486) granting an increase of pension to William H. Johnson;

A bill (S. 487) granting an increase of pension to Edgar H. Jones;

A bill (S. 488) granting an increase of pension to George G. Darrow; and

A bill (S. 489) granting a pension to Elisha Painter.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 490) for the relief of Oliver P. Boyd;

A bill (S. 491) for the relief of William Davenport, John B. Lacoste, William J. Locke, John Green, Theobald Monier, and William A. Wallace, citizens of the State of Texas;

A bill (S. 492) for the relief of Mrs. S. E. Underwood, formerly widow of Samuel Ward, deceased;

A bill (S. 493) for the relief of L. F. Gower, Laura Gower, M. R. Gower, and Mrs. Sarah P. Boykin, heirs of Dr. James Gower, deceased;

A bill (S. 494) for the relief of the heirs of William Stansbury, deceased; and

A bill (S. 495) for the relief of Mrs. Emma L. Bryant, heir at law of Green Caswell Culp, deceased.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a joint resolution (S. J. R. 2) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannon to the board of regents of the University of South Dakota, at Vermillion, S. Dak., to be placed on the campus of said institution, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CUMMINS introduced a joint resolution (S. J. R. 3) directing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a bronze statue of William B. Allison in Washington, D. C., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. J. R. 4) to allow the city and county of San Francisco to exchange lands for reservoir sites in Lake Eleanor and Hetch Hetchy valleys, in Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. J. R. 5) to restore the status of the First Battalion Mountaineers, California Volunteers, who served during the late war of the rebellion, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### INDIAN SERVICE AT OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BURKETT submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the erection of a warehouse for the Indian Service at Omaha, Nebr., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### THE CENSUS.

Mr. BURKETT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, which was referred to the Committee on the Census and ordered to be printed.

#### CALIFORNIA NAVAL BASE.

Mr. FLINT submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. C. Res. 1), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

#### Senate concurrent resolution 1.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Navy is directed, by suitable board, to investigate and report to Congress the advisability and necessity of establishing a naval base, including a navy-yard and repair station, on the coast of the State of California, south of San Francisco; and if the establishment of such naval base is deemed necessary and advisable, at what place on said coast said naval base should be located, and an estimate of the cost of same.*

## EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. WETMORE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

## Senate resolution 3.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Library be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of \$1,440 per annum.

## EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

## Senate resolution 4.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Indian Depredations be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of \$1,200 per annum, said employment to continue during the Sixty-first Congress.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 25, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 22, 1909.*

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Robert T. Devlin, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California. A reappointment, his term having expired on March 7, 1909.

Edward E. Wagner, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota. Mr. Wagner's nomination was sent to the Senate during the first and second sessions, Sixtieth Congress, but not confirmed. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Charles W. Miller, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the district of Indiana, vice Joseph B. Kealing, resigned.

## INDIAN INSPECTOR.

Z. Lewis Dalby, of Roanoke, Va., who was appointed March 6, 1909, during the recess of the Senate to be an Indian inspector, vice Cyrus Beede, term expired.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Clarence Deems, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from March 10, 1909, vice Parkhurst, retired from active service.

Maj. Charles H. Hunter, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 8, 1909, vice Barney, retired from active service.

Maj. Stephen M. Foote, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 10, 1909, vice Deems, promoted.

Capt. George Blakely, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 8, 1909, vice Hunter, promoted.

Capt. Frank W. Coe, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 10, 1909, vice Foote, promoted.

First Lieut. Francis W. Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 8, 1909, vice Blakely, promoted.

First Lieut. George A. Wiczorek, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 10, 1909, vice Coe, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward Canfield, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 15, 1909, vice Gardner, deceased.

Second Lieut. Edward N. Woodbury, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 8, 1909, vice Clark, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ray L. Avery, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 12, 1909, vice Gottlieb, dismissed.

Second Lieut. Edward A. Stockton, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 15, 1909, vice Canfield, promoted.

## INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. George I. Feeter, Seventh Infantry, to be captain from February 28, 1909, vice Shields, Seventh Infantry, resigned.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

## MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

*To be first lieutenants, with rank from March 15, 1909.*

John Anson Burket, of Iowa.

Charles Carroll Demmer, of New York.

Owen Chester Fisk, of Kentucky.

George Burgess Foster, jr., of Pennsylvania.  
James Shelton Fox, of South Carolina.  
James Charles Haley, of New York.  
Howard Hume, of the District of Columbia.  
Thomas Holland Johnson, of Virginia.  
Glenn Irving Jones, of the District of Columbia.  
Charles Tomlinson King, of Indiana.  
Condon Carlton McCornack, of Oregon.  
Edward Leroy Napier, of Alabama.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Hilary Williams to be a lieutenant in the navy from the 1st day of January, 1904, to take rank next after Lieut. Charles T. Owens, U. S. Navy, to correct the date from which he takes rank, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909.

Commander De Witt Coffman to be a captain in the navy from the 1st day of February, 1909, vice Capt. Edward B. Barry, promoted.

Commander Thomas D. Griffin to be a captain in the navy from the 2d day of March, 1909, vice Capt. Hamilton Hutchins, retired.

Lieut. Commander Charles M. McCormick to be a commander in the navy from the 17th day of December, 1908, vice Commander Washington I. Chambers, promoted.

The following named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, upon the completion of three years' service in present grade:

David McD. Le Breton,  
Carl A. Richter,  
Husband E. Kimmel,  
Robert A. Dawes,  
Arthur G. Caffee,  
Clyde S. McDowell,  
Charles C. Soule, jr., and  
Luman E. Morgan.

The following named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

David McD. Le Breton,  
Carl A. Richter,  
Husband E. Kimmel,  
Robert A. Dawes,  
Arthur G. Caffee,  
Clyde S. McDowell,  
Charles C. Soule, jr., and  
Luman E. Morgan.

Second Lieut. Allen M. Sumner to be a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps from the 29th day of December, 1908, vice First Lieut. John Newton, dismissed.

Hugh M. T. Pearce, a citizen of Arkansas, to be a chaplain in the navy from the 5th day of March, 1909, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

## RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John C. Ing, of Sacramento, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Sacramento, Cal., vice William A. Newcum, term expired.

Colon E. Eberhard, of Joseph, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at La Grande, Oreg., vice Albert A. Roberts, resigned.

## POSTMASTERS.

## ARIZONA.

Frank E. Smith to be postmaster at Jerome, Ariz., in place of Dan L. Robinson, resigned.

## CALIFORNIA.

Ora R. Miller to be postmaster at El Centro, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

Flora B. Reynolds to be postmaster at Mill Valley, Cal., in place of Flora B. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1909.

## FLORIDA.

Charles S. Williams to be postmaster at Key West, Fla., in place of George B. Patterson, resigned.

## GEORGIA.

Alice B. Bussey to be postmaster at Cuthbert, Ga., in place of Alice B. Bussey. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1909.

## HAWAII.

George Desha to be postmaster at Hilo, Hawaii, in place of George Desha. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1909.



John N. S. Williams to be postmaster at Kahului, Hawaii. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

## ILLINOIS.

Edgar N. Carter to be postmaster at Oakland, Ill., in place of Edgar N. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1909.

Edward Cole to be postmaster at Marshall, Ill., in place of Etta M. Perdue. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1909.

R. E. Mabry to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ill., in place of William M. Goudy. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1909.

Milton M. Pate to be postmaster at Sandoval, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

## INDIANA.

James E. Leonard to be postmaster at Gas City, Ind., in place of Burr M. Harris, resigned.

## IOWA.

William Stuart to be postmaster at Armstrong, Iowa, in place of Matthew Richmond, resigned.

## KANSAS.

Elva B. Hilton to be postmaster at Attica, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

Charles S. Raines to be postmaster at Galena, Kans., in place of Gordon H. Boughton, deceased.

Charles K. Ware to be postmaster at Downs, Kans., in place of Joseph H. Smith, resigned.

## LOUISIANA.

Charles W. Lyman to be postmaster at Rayne, La., in place of Charles W. Lyman. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1909.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

William R. Brooks to be postmaster at Beverly Farms, Mass., in place of Elmer Standley, resigned.

Fred D. Walker to be postmaster at Belchertown, Mass., in place of Fred D. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1908.

## MINNESOTA.

Charles G. Spaulding to be postmaster at Mapleton, Minn., in place of Charles G. Spaulding. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1909.

Robert S. Tucker to be postmaster at Lake Benton, Minn., in place of Robert S. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1909.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Henry L. Rhodes to be postmaster at Ackerman, Miss., in place of Henry L. Rhodes. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1909.

## MISSOURI.

Sebastian Netscher to be postmaster at Pacific, Mo., in place of Sebastian Netscher. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1909.

Edgar A. Remley to be postmaster at Columbia, Mo., in place of Samuel H. Elkins, deceased.

## MONTANA.

Eugene R. Clingan to be postmaster at Belt, Mont., in place of Eugene R. Clingan. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1909.

Paul C. Long to be postmaster at Taft, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

## NEBRASKA.

Lou W. Frazier to be postmaster at Fairmont, Nebr., in place of Clark Robinson, resigned.

## NEW YORK.

Benjamin A. Babcock to be postmaster at Brasher Falls, N. Y., in place of Wallace H. Wells, deceased.

William L. Cooke to be postmaster at Edmeston, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1908.

Peter S. Krum to be postmaster at Afton, N. Y., in place of Augustus T. England, resigned.

Edward Sautter to be postmaster at Lyons, N. Y., in place of Harry T. Zimmerlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1908.

Isaac M. Smith to be postmaster at Alden, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

Charles M. Walrath to be postmaster at Ellicottville, N. Y., in place of William C. Laidlaw, deceased.

Nathan P. Wild to be postmaster at Valatie, N. Y., in place of Nathan P. Wild. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1908.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

James M. Bunker to be postmaster at Ellendale, N. Dak., in place of James M. Bunker. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1908.

## OHIO.

James L. McDonald to be postmaster at Wellsville, Ohio, in place of Tanner R. Snowden, resigned.

## OKLAHOMA.

Hugh Scott to be postmaster at Waukomis, Okla., in place of Joseph A. Randolph. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1909.

Sid Smith to be postmaster at Stillwell, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1908.

## OREGON.

Byron A. Washburne to be postmaster at Springfield, Oreg., in place of Finley E. Roberts, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

John Cuncannon to be postmaster at Kennett Square, Pa., in place of James M. Worrall, deceased.

James E. Johnston to be postmaster at Barnesboro, Pa., in place of James E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1909.

James C. McGregor to be postmaster at Indiana, Pa., in place of James C. McGregor. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1908.

Leanus Schreiner to be postmaster at Tower City, Pa., in place of Leanus Schreiner. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1909.

Frank A. Springer to be postmaster at Belle Vernon, Pa., in place of Frank A. Springer. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1909.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Edward O. Bromwell to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, S. Dak., in place of Calvin Betts. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1909.

Frank E. Brown to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1907.

## TEXAS.

George W. Crossman to be postmaster at Garland, Tex., in place of George W. Crossman. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1909.

Thomas H. Danforth to be postmaster at Goliad, Tex., in place of Thomas H. Danforth. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1909.

Joseph Fohn to be postmaster at Hondo, Tex., in place of Joseph Fohn. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1909.

Mary S. Parish to be postmaster at Huntsville, Tex., in place of Mary S. Parish. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1909.

James B. Seargent to be postmaster at Orange, Tex., in place of James B. Seargent. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1909.

S. P. Stubbs to be postmaster at Lubbock, Tex., in place of James H. Johnson, deceased.

## WASHINGTON.

DeWitt C. Hostetter to be postmaster at Sumner, Wash., in place of Ernest L. Darr, resigned.

## WISCONSIN.

Christian A. Hansen to be postmaster at Stoughton, Wis., in place of Christian A. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1909.

## CONFIRMATION.

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 22, 1909.*

## RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Colon E. Eberhard to be receiver of public moneys at La Grande, Oreg.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 22, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last were read and approved.

## SWEARING IN OF MEMBER.

Mr. CLARK of Florida appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

## DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that until further order the daily hour of meeting be 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] asks unanimous consent that until further order the daily hour of meeting be 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## THE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1438.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed until he concludes his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed until he concludes his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank the House for the extension of this courtesy, and I will try not to impose upon its good nature by a prolonged continuation of remarks.

I do not think it worth the while at this time to enter upon any academic discussion of the tariff question. The country is overwhelmingly in favor of a protective tariff. It is an American policy. It seems to be acquiesced in by a great majority of the American people. It is true there are some looking for protection to industries who do not come out into the open, who declare themselves in favor of a tariff for revenue, disguising, or trying to disguise, their real belief in a tariff for protection. We have advanced some in the last twenty years in this regard, and now I do not believe that there is a man within the sound of my voice that would rise in his place and say that he is in favor of "tearing down every custom-house in the United States from turret to foundation stone." [Laughter.]

When the McKinley bill was brought into the House a different condition prevailed in the country from that of the present time. Then we had a superabundance of revenue. We were trying to get rid of revenue, and the bill was framed partially with that purpose in mind.

Then we took the duty off sugar, because sugar was a great revenue producer, and we offered a bounty on the production of sugar of 2 cents a pound. That policy was adopted with great unanimity on this side of the House, and that feature went into the law. The McKinley bill became the law just thirty days before the election, and there was no time to meet the falsehoods that were circulated throughout the country with respect to the operations or the prospective operations of the McKinley bill. The election resulted in an overwhelming majority against the promoters of that bill in the House of Representatives; and such was the final result that in 1894 we had the Wilson bill. Of this measure I do not propose to say much. It was like a kaleidoscope. It depended upon which way we looked at it. There was protection in spots and there was free trade in spots, and no well-balanced schedule in the whole bill. It lagged a brief life. It put a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem, or about that, upon sugar, on account, I suppose, of its being a revenue producer, or else it was because by repealing the bounty part of the law it was necessary to have a tariff on sugar in order that the Louisiana plantations might not be wholly destroyed as the result of the bill. This bill hobbled along until

1897, when we had a new President and a new Congress, Republican in this branch, and, by the aid of some Populists, with a bare majority in favor of a protective tariff in the other branch of Congress.

When the Dingley bill was enacted we were looking for revenue; we were running behind in our receipts and could not keep up with our expenditures, due partially from the construction of the bill and partly by the destruction which the Wilson bill had wrought in the industries of the United States.

We cast about for revenue. At the same time we were aiming at protection for American industries. When the bill was brought into the House it was criticised much more severely than the bill which is before the House to-day. All sorts of allegations were made against it; but we finally passed it, and it has proved to be a boon to the people of the United States. I do not need to go back over the industrial progress of this country in the last twelve years to prove my assertion. That history is known and read of all men. Everybody understands that. Closely allied with the features of that bill as the primal cause has been that wonderful growth in the industries of the United States that has been the marvel of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Nor was the Dingley bill a failure as a revenue producer. I have had a little computation made of the entire revenues received under the Dingley bill for the total period from July 1, 1897 (it became a law on the 26th), to March 16, 1909, and I find the total receipts of the United States from all sources except postal were \$6,558,220,264, the total expenditures, except postal, \$6,483,664,856, leaving a surplus for the entire twelve years of its history of \$74,555,408. And these expenditures included \$50,000,000 for the Panama Canal, for which no bonds have been issued; so that the entire surplus over the ordinary expenditures of the Government has been about \$125,000,000 during that period.

But there has been a deficit for the period in the post-office receipts and expenditures, the total receipts being \$1,539,700,032 and the expenditures \$1,638,843,511, a deficit of \$99,143,479. Of course no one will dispute that this post-office deficit resulted largely from the enormous increase of the rural free-delivery service, a service which has proved a boon to the agriculturists of the country, carrying a daily mail to every household in all the thickly settled communities, but at great expense to the Government of the United States and a drain upon its Treasury.

But notwithstanding this enormous drain upon the resources of the Treasury, for the entire period we have a surplus of over \$25,000,000 of ordinary receipts of all kinds over the expenditures, including those of the postal department; surely not a bad showing for a revenue bill which is also a protective measure, and that has stood for twelve years of its duration with this crowning feature of its success.

It is true that this bill has not brought a surplus during every year of its existence. For the last two years the receipts have decreased and the expenditures have increased. The expenditures have increased beyond the anticipation of any of the originators of the Dingley law. We did not dream then of the Spanish war. Much less did we imagine the increased expenditures that would come after that war had ceased, with great victory and honor to the national arms and the national flag, but it brought increased burdens and increased responsibilities. We jumped forward to a place as a world power without a peer in the world. Our relations with other countries were changed. We not only changed the map, but we changed our responsibility with the foreign nations, and with that change came the burdens; the burden of an increasing navy, which seems to be one of the most popular things we have among the citizens of the United States; an increased army, increased coast defenses. Hence we have had extraordinary expenditures, which have been an enormous burden upon the Treasury of the United States.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, the Dingley law has produced during its existence more than sufficient money to pay all these expenditures, enormous as they have been, and to bring in a surplus of \$25,000,000 to the Treasury—an apparent surplus of only \$25,000,000—and yet I am reminded at this point that we have paid out of the money coming into the Treasury, of ordinary receipts, the expenditures in the building of the Panama Canal. It is true we have issued bonds, but the bonds do not appear in this statement. The bonds come into the Treasury and swell the assets of the Treasury, but the Treasury officials have never made the mistake in bookkeeping of adding those as a part of the revenues of the country. They have incurred a debt. To offset that is the money in the Treasury. They do not treat that as revenue. It goes in to keep the Treasury from being depleted, but it does not



appear in the annual expense. So the grand result of the Dingley bill to-day is that, having paid all the expenses of the war and all the expenses incurred thereby, and having expended a large amount for the Panama Canal, there is a surplus of \$25,000,000 for the entire period. [Applause.]

But time makes changes. It becomes necessary to have a revision of our revenue laws. There are two controlling reasons for this revision. Twenty years ago we incorporated into the McKinley bill what is known as the "third section"—a reciprocity provision—which authorized the Executive to make trade agreements with the nations of the earth, and when he procured a trade agreement which was fair and reasonable for the people of the United States with any country he proclaimed that fact, and thereupon the third section went into operation and duties on certain articles were fixed on a lower scale than in the general law.

We incorporated the same third section into the Dingley bill, and provided that where these trade agreements were made on a fair and reasonable basis there should be a reduction in duty on a few articles only—argols, or wine lees, on wines both still and sparkling, and on works of art from 20 to 15 per cent—not a very large inducement to offer to the nations of the world, and yet it was all that Congress was willing to offer at that time.

Under this third section the Government has gone on and made commercial agreements with most of the nations of the earth and has obtained favorable trade relations, not as favorable as have been made to some other countries, but more favorable than the maximum tariff had ever seen fit to impose it upon us, and all for the concessions contained in section 3 on these four different classes of articles.

Trade agreements were made under the McKinley bill, but when the Wilson bill became a law, or, rather, when it was introduced into the House, it was found that all these trade agreements, without giving notice to any nations of the earth, were repealed by the repeal of the third section. Pretty rough treatment with friendly nations, with no regard to the courtesy which should exist between these nations and ourselves. By this simple amendment they were all wiped out with one blow, and the repeal gave notice that Congress had abrogated the third section and their agreements were no longer of any effect.

Since the time of the enactment of the Dingley bill other nations have been adopting the maximum and minimum tariff, with a lower tariff at protected rates and a maximum tariff much higher—even 100 per cent over the minimum rates, scarcely ever below 40 per cent—although some of the articles of these maximum and minimum tariff countries are at the same rates in both maximum and minimum schedules.

Then came the tug of war. Then came the hard part of the proposition. We saw our rivals for the trade of the world getting conventional rates that we could not get, partially because of our system that under the Constitution no change can be made in the tariff except Congress takes the initiative. We must pass legislation to enable the Executive to offer favorable trade agreements. It is with us here to originate it. Under the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate, no amendment could be made to the tariff law providing for a single change of this condition or any other without opening the whole schedule of the bill to amendment—not of the bill, but of the present revenue laws. Congress was hampered if it desired to give a freer hand to the Executive to cope with these new conditions that had come into existence after the Dingley law was passed.

The situation was becoming intolerable. We could not meet these new conditions under the third section of the Dingley act. Already one or more nations were giving us the worst of it in their trade relations, giving us the maximum rates and shutting out what the energy and wisdom and foresight of some of our people had accomplished in entering into their trade with the manufacturers, the products of the labor of the United States. That hastened the time when it was best to take up the consideration of the revision of the tariff schedules.

With respect to the time, I have always stood upon this proposition: You can not revise the tariff without halting manufacture and trade and industry. I said I was ready to undertake the work any time that it should appear that it was to the interests of the American people to go through the sacrifice of the period of passing a tariff bill, because they could get greater advantages in the end than they would suffer from the temporary destruction of business, and this condition hastened the time. Then the revenues during the latter days did not seem to be keeping up with the expenditures of the Government.

The time had come to hunt for more revenue in a tariff bill, and these two considerations hastened the consideration by

the House and the country of a new tariff act. Hence it came about that the Republican platform in the last election pledged the party to the revision of the tariff. Already, before that, your Committee on Ways and Means had begun its work, anticipating the verdict of the country, even before the Chicago convention met, and that committee had set its clerks to work looking up information that would aid the committee in the passage of this bill. When they were ready to undertake the work, even at the hearings, they had provided for them a comparison of duties and of imports for the last fifteen years that enabled them at a glance to see what effect this duty or that in each paragraph had had upon the importation of goods under it. No witness could come before them and with an array of figures that he had gained from some newspaper, be privileged to assert that the importations under the paragraph were great, enormous, showing that there was no protection, without being met by some member of the committee with the cold facts, which in some cases showed that the importations were very small, and oftentimes took all there was out of the argument that the witness had made.

This was the beginning of it. Then in May last we passed a resolution authorizing the committee to gather information from all sources, to call on every department of the Government for clerical aid, to call into the deliberations of the committee every tariff expert in all the departments. When that resolution was passed I went to the President of the United States and told him what people I desired to have detailed, and he said, "You can detail anybody from any department to aid your committee;" and we went to work, before the Chicago convention, gathering information. We sent schedules to every consulate of the United States in all the foreign countries, with carefully prepared questions, to ascertain the condition of the industries in those countries, especially the condition of the workmen, the wages paid, the cost of the unit of manufacture—everything that would enable us to arrive at a just conclusion. Hundreds of those answers came back, and they were filed for the confidential information of the committee, but available to its members, to get at the facts contained in those reports; and often they have been of great value, sometimes confirming to a remarkable degree the statements made by manufacturers before the committee as to the wages paid abroad and sometimes not confirming the statements of the manufacturers, but all tending to give the committee accurate information.

Agents were sent out from the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Bureau of Manufactures, traveling over the world, visiting factories, getting at the facts from the first source, and reporting them for the information of the committee, many of which reports have been published and are available to the Members of the House. This work was done in anticipation of a revision of the tariff.

Under the direction of the clerk of the committee every decision of the courts and of the general appraisers was examined and digested, a vast amount of material information gathered, from which was published *The Notes and Comments*, a publication of great service to the committee and of lasting benefit to the student of economics for years to come.

Promptly after the election the committee were called together by telegraph, and people in the United States were notified by telegraph of hearings, commencing on the 10th day of November, and the committee sat in its rooms from half past 9 in the morning until 11 or 12 o'clock at night, except on those infrequent occasions when the words and the wind of the witnesses gave out at a little earlier period and gave us a little rest, until the 24th day of December, working every day, listening to the testimony of these people who knew the facts. A great many of them, with unwillingness, were forced to give up the facts which were material to a revision of the tariff.

Promptly when these hearings were closed the committee met. I can not disclose what was done in the committee, but its deliberations resulted in the appointment of a subcommittee, consisting of the majority members of the committee, to frame a bill, and the gentlemen on the other side had the privilege—I do not know whether they availed themselves of it or not—of framing a bill according to their understanding of the subject. This was not without precedent. In every one of the three tariff bills that have been formulated since I have been a member of the committee, commencing with the McKinley bill, precisely that course was adopted. You can see how difficult it would be with 12 men believing in protection to American industries—fair protection, honest protection, to American industries—on the one hand, and 6 or 7 other men, believing I know not what, going into a conference with the idea of reaching an harmonious conclusion in the framing of a bill. Why, if we had adopted that course, Mr. Chairman, instead of reporting this bill on the 15th day of March, 1909, we would have been

lucky if there had been enough surviving members of the committee to report it on the 15th of March, 1910.

We did just what we were compelled to do, and that was to forego the pleasure of the presence of our Democratic brethren while we sat around the table and made this bill. We still met at half past 9 in the morning and we adjourned when we got tired, and we sat every day until the bill was finally reported on the 15th of March. So, whatever may be said about this committee and about this bill, the country never can say that this committee has not labored early and late from beginning to end to get all the information possible, and when they came to consider the bill paragraph by paragraph, to study that information in order to form a tariff bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, the question of revenues under this bill is a serious question, and yet it is not so serious as it would appear at first blush. It is true we had a big deficit on the 1st day of July last for the previous year, but we had had a big depression in business. Importations had halted, revenues had been cut down, and when that continued during the fiscal year 1909 down to the present time, showing a deficiency of \$87,000,000, it looked like a difficult task to provide sufficient revenue for the expenditures of the Government.

But this was only a surface view of the case because, with reviving industry, with prosperity, with putting money in the purses of the people that their demands may be supplied importations will increase, revenues will increase from all the sources from which the Government derives revenue, and it would not be fair to strive to make up a deficiency of probably \$100,000,000 as things were going for the present fiscal year in order to make a bill that should extend into several years in the future. We have all noticed with pleasure that with increasing revenue the deficit for the first twenty days of the present month is less than \$1,000,000.

The committee took up the question further than that. They took up the appropriations made by the last session of Congress amounting to \$1,044,014,298.23. Those seemed to be appalling figures, but we looked into it to see what those appropriations were made up of, to see what part of them demanded cash from the Treasury, from the revenues of the Government. We found there were \$60,000,000 of appropriations for the sinking fund. Now, there is a law which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to set aside \$60,000,000 for the sinking fund for this fiscal year, and that law has been enforced—I said “enforced,” but I meant to say “in force” ever since it was enacted sometime after the war, and yet everybody knows the law is not complied with.

The Secretary has not had the money to do it, and it would seem to be a useless thing for him to do it. If the money was in the Treasury, it still would not be necessary for him to set it aside for that purpose; and that sinking-fund appropriation is in default several hundred million dollars—I do not know the precise amount—and that leads us to the conclusion that it is no part of our duty to provide that \$60,000,000 sinking fund by adding additional taxes to the tariff bill. We eliminated that from the calculations. A few years ago Congress by law turned over into the general fund of the Treasury the amount of money there held in trust for the purpose of redeeming national-bank notes in cases where banks gave up their circulation or went out of business. It went into the General Treasury and the Government assumed the responsibility of redeeming those notes. Of course, that money is not paid out of general taxation. It is paid out of the money that the national banks are compelled to deposit when they begin to retire their notes, and there is no need of providing that in the revenue bill to the amount of \$30,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, when we passed the Panama Canal legislation we provided for bonds for the payment of the appropriations for the canal. It was the policy of Congress that this great expenditure of money for such work as has been contemplated, dreamed of for more than four hundred years and to be a work of centuries, running way down into the future, should be paid for in the first instance by bonds issued by the Government of the United States and giving posterity, and the revenues of the canal when they came in, an opportunity to pay for this canal. Bonds were provided for in the original act and bonds have been authorized. Not for all the money that has been expended. Bonds were not authorized, through some oversight, for the \$40,000,000 purchase. There was seven or eight million dollars already paid out otherwise than this \$40,000,000 of purchase that has not been provided for by bonds, and the appropriations for 1910 contain the amount of \$35,886,190.58 for the construction of the Panama Canal during that fiscal year.

The Treasury Department has authority now to issue these bonds if they were necessary to replenish the cash in the Treas-

ury; it should not be counted as a part of the money that it is our duty to raise by taxation, because it is contrary to the policy of the law by which we commenced the work of this canal and under which we propose to complete it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will it interrupt the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish the gentlemen would talk a little louder; we can not hear them.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman refer to me or the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Both of you—

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York whether or not he has taken into consideration the fact that the authority for the issuing of bonds for the construction of the canal would be very nearly exhausted by the end of this fiscal year, and that at the last session of Congress, Congress refused to authorize the issuing of bonds to meet the expenditures for the fiscal year 1910, and therefore the canal expenditures for 1910 will have to be paid out of the current revenues of that year unless authority is given during this session of Congress?

Mr. PAYNE. This \$35,000,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. The amount carried in the last sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad the gentleman stated that. I shall ask the committee to amend the bill giving that authorization. The policy of the law should be carried out.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Appropriations recommended an issue of bonds to meet the appropriations authorized in the sundry civil act. It went out on a point of order in the House. It was put in again in the committee of the Senate, and the Senate struck it out, so that the appropriations for canal expenditures for the fiscal year 1910 are made without any authority to meet these expenditures from the proceeds of the sale of bonds.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I was not familiar with the history of the legislation. The fact is that during the last session of the last Congress I was hardly in my seat for a moment, because I had other matters pressing for attention over at the Office Building, and was not able to keep up with the legislation as it progressed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. In that same connection, I wish to say that I obtained the figures this morning from the Treasury Department. The authorized issue of bonds for the construction of the canal is \$130,000,000; that the appropriation of the last Congress, including the amount which has been appropriated for the construction of the canal proper, not including some moneys for the Panama Railroad, is one hundred and forty-five millions and some odd.

Mr. PAYNE. That includes the appropriation for 1910?

Mr. MANN. That includes the appropriation for the fiscal year 1910, not including the original \$10,000,000 which was appropriated. Now, it is perfectly manifest that there must be authority to issue new bonds over the one hundred and thirty million now authorized, or else the construction work must be paid out of the revenues in the Treasury. Now, will the gentleman consider an amendment increasing the bond issue authorized in connection with the proposed forty millions bond issue?

Mr. PAYNE. I certainly would, so far as I am individually concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like permission from the gentleman from New York to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a question in order to bring out one further fact and clear up this bond situation. What is the amount of the Panama bonds that have already been issued under that one hundred and thirty million authorization?

Mr. MANN. Eighty-four million six hundred and thirty-one thousand nine hundred and eighty dollars.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, how much does that leave you?

Mr. MANN. I have not the exact figures. It is in the neighborhood of \$45,000,000. But the total amount which has been proposed, for which bonds might be issued if the authority is extended, is \$145,688,204.31.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think I can make it entirely plain to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. Owing to the fact that the expenditures have vastly exceeded the bond issue, under the law authorizing the refunding to the Treasury of those expenditures, these bonds that are now authorized might all be issued to replace cash in the Treasury already expended



on account of the Panama Canal, and when it becomes necessary to replace that cash, by issuing these bonds for that purpose, there would then be no bonds issuable for the expenses of the appropriation made for the year ending June 30, 1910.

Mr. MANN. In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], if the gentleman will permit, the amount which I give as the amount of the appropriation does not include \$4,380,000 and some odd which has been advanced to the Panama Railway Company and which is to be reimbursed.

Mr. PAYNE. It seems, according to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, that we still have authority to issue about \$45,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but that will not provide for the entire amount of money which has been appropriated up to the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. PAYNE. That \$45,000,000 which will come into the Treasury and be there for general expenditure when the bonds are issued. And so it does not at all interfere with the argument which I made that we can, by the issue of bonds, replace this \$35,000,000 appropriated during 1910, or an equivalent amount, even up to \$45,000,000.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I simply intended to supplement the gentleman's argument, in order to enforce the argument which the gentleman makes.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, deducting these three several sums, amounting to \$125,886,190.58, we have \$918,128,170.65 that is to be provided for. Well, the committee went a little further into this subject. We had some ideas that the appropriations were not expended each year and that a certain percentage of unexpended appropriations is found in the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year. I had an idea in my mind it amounted to 8 or 10 per cent. We called in the very accomplished clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, who probably knows as much about that as any Member of the House, and who has had longer experience, and I do not know that anybody would take offense if I should state that he has more information than anyone else on the subject; and he said the average of the unexpended appropriations would equal each year 6 or 8 per cent. The committee thought they would take a conservative estimate of the unexpended appropriations, and so deducted 5 instead of 6 or 8 per cent a year from the amount of money that has to be raised. After taking this 5 per cent off we have \$872,221,701.77. Now, these appropriations include all the expenditures of the post-office and everything else.

Then we looked at the report of the Secretary of the Treasury made last November and the estimated revenue: From internal revenue, \$250,000,000; miscellaneous revenues, \$62,000,000; postal revenues, \$223,340,712. Then we had a careful estimate made of the schedules under this bill as we had prepared it. In fact, we prepared some of the schedules after we had the estimate made. We were looking for revenue and we found that the final estimate of revenues from the tariff part of the bill were \$305,225,173. Still desiring to be conservative in these figures, we based this estimate, not upon the importations of 1907, which was a boom year, a year of the largest importations and which produced about \$330,000,000 under the tariff schedules of the Dingley act, but we took it from the year 1906, going back three years prior to the time this bill will be in operation, discounting all the increase in population, increase in business resources, increase in everything—the growth of the United States for four years. We went back to 1906 and took the importations of that year under the Dingley Act as the basis of computation and found that the revenues from the tariff would amount to more than \$305,000,000.

At least, we were safe in making that estimate. Then we add an inheritance tax, of which I will speak later. We made an estimate of that. It was difficult to get at. There were meager statistics on the subject. A New York newspaper published last Saturday a report of the amount of the revenues received by the States on that account, because we have in operation now an inheritance-tax law in several States. Now, the aggregate in 33 States was \$12,000,000, in round numbers. But the taxes in the various States were less than those imposed in our bill. The taxes in my own State were less than the rate upon direct descent in our bill; and yet, in the State of New York there are between five and six millions, nearly six millions of revenue, from the inheritance tax; and we thought, and we still think, that \$20,000,000 from this source is a fair, conservative estimate of the revenue to be received from it.

We added an extra tax upon cigarettes. Whereas they are now paying \$3 per thousand, or a little less than that, according to the grade, we added 50 and 60 cents a thousand, and on last year's consumption this would amount to a million and a half dollars additional revenue.

We summed all these sources of revenue up and they came to \$862,065,885, and this left an apparent deficit of \$10,155,816.77. We continued our investigation a little further. We found that there was a discrepancy between the Bureau of Commerce and Labor's report and that of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount of the revenue from the tariff, and after we came to that conclusion, we found that the tonnage and some other taxes were not included in the report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and they amounted to \$6,341,458.27, and should be added to the estimated revenue of this bill, and thus the total is about \$3,000,000 apparent deficit.

Mr. Chairman, of course no one can say what the revenue will be under this bill from the 1st day of July next for the following fiscal year. That is largely speculation; but we have taken the same means to find out what it would be that has been employed in relation to the other tariff bills, and we find that those in the main have been conservative, as to the other bills, but not so conservative as we have tried to make them with this. We have a fair and reasonable hope and prospect that this bill during the first year of its existence will leave no deficit in the Treasury of the United States.

But suppose there is a small deficit, Mr. Chairman? We have in the Treasury to-day \$135,000,000 of available cash assets to meet any deficit that may come in the next year. We have provided for the issue of \$40,000,000 of bonds to replace \$40,000,000 of purchase money of the Panama Canal, which would make \$175,000,000 available if the Secretary of the Treasury should deem it best to issue those bonds during the next fiscal year. And we have in addition to that, according to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, an authorization of \$45,000,000 more, authorized by the original Panama Canal act, available to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue during the next fiscal year. It seems to me that there is no question for any gentleman to get panicky over, about the revenues under this bill. I have no doubt after the bill becomes a law and business settles down, in the year 1911 it will do what it is sent out to do, provide sufficient revenue for the Government.

Nor is that all, Mr. Chairman. I think there is some room for economy in our expenditures. Economy can be brought about by this House—

Mr. SIMS. Before we get away from the canal bond issue of \$40,000,000—the gentleman speaks of issuing bonds to reimburse the Treasury. Is it the idea of the gentleman that in the future there will be receipts from the Panama Canal to take up those bonds, that there will be a revenue from charges made by the Government for using the canal—

Mr. PAYNE. I think undoubtedly there will be a revenue some day. Perhaps it will not be in the gentleman's lifetime or mine. It took the Suez Canal a long time to produce a revenue to pay the interest on its bonds; but I think it is sure to come.

Mr. SIMS. And the gentleman's idea, then, in issuing bonds is that the Treasury will ultimately be relieved of that charge; that the burden ultimately will not come out of the common taxpayers. Is that it?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I think ultimately; but whether we do or not, this canal is built for the ages. Why not let the people of the ages share a part of the burden of the building? [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, in reply to that question, I can not see any difference between issuing bonds to pay current demands on the Treasury and in issuing bonds to take the place of the current revenue already expended on the Panama Canal if they have both got to be paid by the common taxpayers in the end.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that we had a large surplus in the Treasury when we entered upon the building of this canal, and we have paid the money out of the Treasury. Some of us were desirous of reducing the surplus somewhat, so that it should not be in sight every time a man came in here for an appropriation, and should not tempt the people of the country to raid the Treasury because there was a big surplus in it. I do not believe in a large surplus, but I believe in fortifying the Treasury, so that no warrant of the United States will ever suffer the slightest danger of remaining unpaid for a single minute after it is presented to the Treasury. [Applause on the Republican side.] Right there, Mr. Chairman, it was reported in some newspaper a few weeks ago that the Treasury would now be bankrupt if it was not for the fact that the late Secretary of the Treasury had held back some \$50,000,000 of warrants. Inquiry of the Treasury Department developed the fact that that statement was made out of the whole cloth, that every warrant was being paid regularly and in order as it came to the Treasury for payment.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have guarded against any deficit in the Treasury, but we have gone a little further than that. In the

war revenue act the Committee on Ways and Means reported a section providing against any contingency of a deficit in the Treasury.

We provided for the issue of \$100,000,000 of certificates, to run for one year at not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, so that in any time of stress the Secretary of the Treasury might go out and borrow money and provide sufficient funds temporarily for the necessities of the Treasury. When we repealed the war revenue act by two separate bills we were careful not to repeal this section, but left it there for that purpose. It has been suggested to the committee, and the committee of its own motion made the suggestion as well, to increase that limit from one hundred million to two hundred and fifty million dollars, and we put that into the bill. With that section added, the Treasury seems to be fortified and buttressed at every point, so that gentlemen may have no nervous spell over the Treasury if this bill becomes a law as it is brought in here by your committee.

Mr. Chairman, I will take up some of the schedules in the bill. In the first place we have provided a minimum and maximum tariff. Our minimum tariff is a protective tariff, built on the lines of our party platform and sometimes a little more than the party platform, because it is impossible to hold the scales evenly, even with all the information available to your committee on all these schedules; but it is the firm belief of your committee that if this first section, providing for a minimum tariff, is put into effect and it becomes the universal tariff law, as we believe it will, in the United States in their dealings with all foreign countries, no business will suffer from unfair and unequal competition from any foreign source, and every laborer in the United States will continue to receive good and fair compensation for the work which he performs. We believe it is a protective tariff.

Then we provide that any country which gives us as fair trade relations as they give to any other country, which makes no discrimination against us which they do not make against the most favored nation under their conventions or tariffs, shall receive this minimum tariff provided for in sections 1 and 2. But if they do not, if they do not give us an equal chance in their markets with any other nation, we do not propose to allow them to come into our market at this minimum rate. Our market is the market of the world, for we are the greatest consumers, the greatest buyers of any nation on earth, consuming from one-third to one-half of the productions of the world over.

Some gentlemen have pretended to get nervous over that. I have seen some items in the newspapers that this was a trick on the part of the committee, that while we had reduced rates in the first section we had added 20 per cent of duty in some instances to the Dingley rate, and in some instances to the free section, and that that was the joker; that the maximum rate was the rate on which the nations of the earth were to enter our markets. Did they stop to think that that great country of our cousins—the English—give us, as they give every other nation of the earth, equal trade relations, and from the very moment that this bill becomes a law until it is finally repealed Great Britain will be entitled to come into this country with its products precisely at the minimum rates in sections 1 and 2?

Take her great rivals for our market, France and Germany; can they stand by and see Great Britain take up that trade and they do nothing? Will they enforce their maximum rate against us because we do not give them our minimum rate? Will they force our maximum rates on exports to this country and see Great Britain come in and take the trade of this market? Is there any man within the sound of my voice that supposes for a minute that France and Germany and the nations of the earth seeking our markets will not immediately avail themselves of the minimum rate which we offer in sections 1 and 2?

We provide that no maximum rate shall go into effect within sixty days after the passage of the bill. We give them an opportunity to make their rates with us or put themselves on an equality with Great Britain. Now, you may call it a club, you may call it reciprocal trade, you may call it holding out the olive branch of peace in trade by giving them the minimum rates if they deal fairly with us, but whatever you call it it is absolutely certain that the great nations of the earth will take the advantage which we give them under sections 1 and 2 of this act to make their rates with us such as to get the rates prescribed in these sections.

Mr. Chairman, the bill does not keep up the Dingley rates on section 1. We have utilized these hearings to adjust the rates under section 1. We have followed somewhat the line of President McKinley in his Buffalo speech—that speech that has been

so often misquoted and lied about on the stump, wherein he used this language:

If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

We have taken up the duties under this bill no longer needed at the rates prescribed for protection. Unfortunately, they seem to be needed in some cases for the revenue. We offer, also, rates to those countries of the world that they may come in here and pay the tariff that Great Britain pays upon her products and trade with us. Of course, Mr. Chairman, every country that seeks trade in the country having a protective tariff must make up its mind, and its manufacturers must make up their minds, to pay the tariff to enter into the trade of that country. That is a rule of economic law that can not be overridden or disregarded. We give them rates by which they may pay our tariff and come in, sometimes in equal competition and sometimes in not quite equal competition, with our manufacturers, in seeking our markets here; and all we ask of them is that they shall do the same thing to us and leave it to the skill and the enterprise of our manufacturers to go into their markets and pay tariff rates on even terms with every other foreign country and seek in open competition for their trade.

Mr. Chairman, it was not an easy question to adjust these rates. As I said before, the committee have considered every paragraph of the Dingley bill, reading it through carefully, reading the evidence, considering it, and finally adjusting the rates. Of course, we did not all agree to each paragraph after we had read the hearing on it. The committee differed. I do not suppose there is any member of the twelve who is fully satisfied with every paragraph in this bill which we propose, but it was the judgment of the majority of that committee, in which we all finally agreed, and the 12 Republican members bring in this bill as a unanimous agreement for the tariff bill which, after its enactment, shall be in force in this country.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of the maximum and minimum tariff, I would like to call his attention to the proviso at the end of section 4 of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman has called my attention to that. There have not been a great many mistakes made in the printing of this bill, but when clerks have to work until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning it can not be expected that they will get everything all right, and so it transpires that the fourth section, the maximum and minimum section—that is, the application of the maximum and the minimum rate—is printed in the bill as originally drafted and not as finally agreed upon by the committee. Possibly this may have been the result of my own mistake.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this small print is correct.

Mr. PAYNE. No; it is not. This print was printed from the print of the bill as introduced, and the proof was read in the Printing Office and not by the clerk of the committee, and I have discovered several mistakes in it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was not trying to bother the gentleman at all—

Mr. PAYNE. No; but I say I have found a number of mistakes in it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was trying to ascertain whether the proviso that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] called attention to, as printed on page 74, is as the gentleman intends it to stand?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman means the proviso?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; this proviso printed on page 74. Is that the way the gentleman intends it to stand?

Mr. PAYNE. It is not the way that the committee agreed upon; and I was just saying for the benefit of the gentleman and the committee, that since the bill was reported to the House it has been found that there are errors in the print which the committee did not intend to be there. I was about to explain that. I was going to read the proviso first as it reads in the print, and then the proposed change in it. I read from page 74 of one print (Report No. 1), and it will be found on page 152 of the comparative document. The proviso reads in the printed bill:

*Provided, however,* That these provisions for additional duties shall not apply to the cases where the preferential duties to other countries are those which are given to a province, dependency, or colony to the mother country only.

That would apply as it reads only where a colony gave preference to the mother country. The intention of the committee is that where the mother country gives preference to a colony as



well, these provisions of the bill should not apply. I will ask the Clerk to read the substitute which I hope to offer at the proper time for section 4, making changes in the original text of section 4 as printed, and also in this proviso.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 4 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 4. Whenever any country, province, dependency, or colony admits each and every article imported into said country, province, dependency, or colony from the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), the growth or product in whole or in part of the soil or industry of the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), upon payment thereon of duties, imposts, excises, or taxes which shall not be in excess of those levied upon like articles imported from any other country, province, dependency, or colony, and admits such articles on terms as favorable as those accorded to any article imported from any other country, province, dependency, or colony, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon articles imported into the United States and any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands) from such country, province, dependency, or colony, the growth or product of the soil or industry of such country, province, dependency, or colony, and whether such articles are shipped from the ports of such country, province, dependency, or colony, or from any other foreign port or ports, the rate of duty prescribed in section 1 of this act; and in like cases the articles mentioned in section 2 of this act shall be admitted free of duty.

Whenever on or after sixty days after the passage of this act any country, province, dependency, or colony discriminates against any article imported from the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), the growth or product, in whole or in part, of the soil or industry of the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), by levying duties, imposts, excises, or taxes thereon in excess of those levied upon similar articles imported from any other country, province, dependency, or colony, or in any way fails to admit any article imported from the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), on terms as favorable as those accorded to any article imported from, and the products of any other country, province, dependency, or colony, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), the growth or product of the soil or industry of such country, province, dependency, or colony so discriminating against any article imported from the United States the rates of duty prescribed in section 3. *Provided however*, That these provisions for additional duties shall not apply to the cases where the preferential duties are those which are given by and between a province, dependency, colony, or the mother country only.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have had this read in order that it might be printed in the RECORD and meet the scrutiny of Members of the House. It has been not an easy section to draw, but the committee believe they have perfected it now; but still, among the nearly 400 Members of the House, they would be glad to receive any suggestion that would in any way tend to clear the section or make it in any better manner express the intention of the committee.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Under that amendment the country which has preferential rates with its dependencies or colonies would, nevertheless, be entitled to our minimum rates.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly; if they were otherwise entitled they certainly would be under this.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER. Under this amendment, if there were preferential duties between different colonies of the same country, as between Canada and Australia, would not the maximum duties go into effect?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think so, if the gentleman will carefully study the language when he sees it; and I would be glad after he has done so to receive his opinion and any suggestion that the gentleman has to offer.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I ask for information, Mr. Chairman. In order to secure the benefits of the minimum rates as fixed in the new bill it will be necessary for the parliaments of the foreign countries to meet and offer to this country agreements for that purpose. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means whether the time which is provided for in this bill, namely, sixty days, is a sufficient time for the foreign countries to comply with that provision?

Mr. PAYNE. I understand the German Reichstag is now in session, and I suppose they are taking notice of what we are doing here, and in some of the other countries they have authority outside, an executive authority, without the meeting of parliament.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And is there anything in the bill which would enable us to enter into these special agreements which would secure to us the most-favored-nation clauses in their tariff bills and in return extend to them the minimum rates?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman the committee considered the question whether it was better to continue, as

under the third section of the Dingley bill, and authorize the Executive to make agreements, and when the proclamation of such agreement was made for this minimum to go into effect, or to make this section automatic, so that whenever any country gave us their favorable trade relations, the Secretary of the Treasury might collect the revenues according to whether they had or not given us the most favorable trade relation, or whether they discriminated against us or not.

And if the Secretary of the Treasury made a mistake, it would be up to any importer of goods to bring an action to decide the matter in court upon evidence. We thought that was a better way to determine it than to put it up to the Executive or to the State Department and have some clerk in the State Department without sufficient authority collect evidence, prepare agreements, and decide that serious question. So we left it in the bill as it is, preferring that it should be automatic in its operation, depending upon whether they did, in fact, or not give a favorable trade relation, and that fact, if a mistake is made, to be settled in the courts of the United States. So we have wiped out the provision of section 3 in regard to negotiations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak of some of the changes made in this bill. The committee have transferred some items from the free list to the dutiable list. They have increased the duty on some paragraphs. They have not done this under cover. They published these in the statement and in the report made and court the attention of the Members of the House and the country to the changes they have made. The increases are few in number. They are not very serious, but every one of them was made for a reason, after examining the evidence that was before the committee.

In Schedule A, the chemical schedule, we have increased the duty on perfumeries and toilet articles from 50 to 60 per cent. We thought that was a fair subject for revenue, and that 60 per cent would produce more revenue than 50 per cent. That was not taxing any man's breakfast table. That is not open to any hue and cry on the part of any demagogue in the United States. It is to increase the revenue.

Now, we have made some other similar increases. We have increased fancy soap from 15 to 20 cents a pound. You and I and the other common people can still buy our castle soap at the old rate, which is sufficient for the ordinary toilet purposes of the ordinary man, but if people want fancy soaps let them pay a little more into the Treasury of the United States and furnish a little more revenue.

Schedule C is the iron and steel schedule. We increased two items, namely, swords and side arms, from 35 to 50 per cent ad valorem. I do not believe there will be much kicking about that. I got this morning, about an hour before the House met, a sketch of the views of the minority to be filed. They had overlooked this increase on swords and side arms, as they did on bottle caps, the foil that goes over the top of a champagne bottle. I say champagne bottle because possibly more of my auditors will recognize what it is. They have increased the duty on that from 45 to 50 per cent ad valorem.

And then there is chicory root, which adulterates the coffee of the honest man that tries to buy the pure article. We increase the duty on that from 1 cent to 2½ cents. I do not know but that some Member will get up and talk about taxing the poor man's breakfast table. We do not believe in letting adulterants come in without being taxed.

And then there is cocoa. We increase cocoa butter, dandelion root, and other adulterants and articles used as a substitute for coffee from 2½ cents to 4 cents a pound.

Spices, unground, have always been on the free list. Why they have not been made to pay a revenue duty I do not know. I do not use any of them myself, because I think the only proper use for them is when you go to a bar to get a drink. Therefore I do not have any occasion to use them. I do not believe that they are a useful article of food. I believe the human stomach is better without them than with them; but some people think they have got to have them, and if that is so, let them pay a revenue duty on them. We transferred spices, unground, from the free list to the dutiable list at 30 per cent ad valorem, and then when they are manufactured, at 30 per cent ad valorem, and in addition to that the same duty per pound that was originally on the manufactured article when the unmanufactured was on the free list. I do not believe anybody is going to get up any serious complaint about that. If they do, they will not be able to catch the ear of many people.

And then we raised feathers from 15 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem, and feathers, dressed, colored, and so forth, from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. Furs, dressed on the skins, from 20 per cent to 27½ per cent. Manufactures of hair, from 20 to 25 per cent. That is hard on baldheaded men; yet if you will

wear a wig contrary to the law of nature, why, in heaven's name, should you not pay a reasonable duty? [Laughter.]

Then we have increased the duty on some articles where we thought that the protection under the law did not measure up to the plank of the Chicago platform which we believe in.

Oxalic acid, which up to the time of the Dingley bill was not made in this country, was kept on the free list. Some enterprising people have gone to work and are manufacturing oxalic acid, and with a little protection they can supply the wants of this country and set people to work. Why should they not do it? Since they have been conducting business their foreign competitors have come in to drive them out by lowering the price, and they can not meet the competition. It is either duty or closing up of the factory. We preferred to keep the factory open, and we put a duty of 1 cent a pound on it, which would equal 25 per cent, as I recollect it, or about that.

We increased the duty on coal-tar dyes or colors from 30 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem. The committee did not do this without doing the subject full justice so far as investigations were concerned, because these colors are used in the manufactures of goods. We found that some enterprising gentlemen had put \$2,000,000 into a factory to manufacture these dyes. They did it soon after the tariff rates were put in the Dingley bill, believing that under that they could meet the foreign competition and establish the business. What was the result? Nearly all the colors manufactured from coal tars were invented in Germany. I am sorry to have to confess it, but the truth is that the chemists in Germany beat the world. There are no equals anywhere in the world to the German chemist, and he is ingenious, constantly at work, and out of 4,000 different materials that are found in common coal tar they have extracted color after color and have cheapened processes of manufacture. In most instances these dyes enter into the color of all textiles the world over. They get out a patent in Germany, and under our very favorable patent laws they take out a patent here for their invention, and then they let our people have them for whatever prices they ask.

But it happens that twelve years ago the patents in some of these colors had expired in the United States and these enterprising men here wanted to go into the business and thought that when that rate of duty was fixed they would be able to maintain the manufacture here. But, as I say, the Germans came in here and dumped colors in the market, and as often as our people succeeded in making the color and putting it on the market, the Germans came in and sold cheaper colors, or an equal color at a less price, driving them out of the production of that branch; and then they started up something else. The Germans, in the meantime, sometimes recouped themselves on the patented colors that they had. These gentlemen showed us their balance sheets for seven years. They showed them privately and confidentially to the members of the committee, and when we read these we concluded to raise this duty from 30 to 35 per cent. We want to make these dyes in this country, by American labor, out of the abundant supply we have of coal tar, for the benefit of the people of this country, and in order to let them make this product we have increased this duty from 30 to 35 per cent.

These are all the increases we made in the chemical schedule. We have 80 paragraphs in this schedule.

In Schedule B we increase the duty on Keene's cement from 30 to 35 per cent ad valorem. Keene's cement is made out of gypsum and is a new article of commerce. In all the hotels in Washington where you see these beautiful marble columns you would naturally think they were dug from the bowels of the earth and finished by the labor of man. They are shaped by the use of Keene's cement. They are beautiful. They seem almost an improvement on nature. When you come to look at them you would think that nature had done the work. We were making that and thought that we were doing fairly well, but a few years ago there began quite an importation of it. They came along here and asked us for a miserable little increase of 5 per cent on the duty, and we very gladly put it in the bill.

We want to make Keene's cement in this country, so that future generations can see what we have contributed to the beauty of the modern hotel and office building by encouraging this industry.

Asphaltum we changed from a specific duty that meant in one case a small percentage, and in another a large percentage on valuation, to fifteen one-hundredths of 1 per cent per pound on the bitumen contained therein. That is the same kind of a duty as the duty on lead ores, a duty on the amount of stuff there is in the substance; and, if it comes in with 20 per cent, it pays a duty on 400 pounds to the ton; if it comes in at 90

per cent, it pays a duty on the corresponding number of pounds to the ton, so that it is an equalized duty all the way through.

Fluorspar, crude, from 10 per cent ad valorem to 50 cents per ton; crushed or otherwise manufactured, from 20 per cent ad valorem to \$1.75 per ton.

Cast polished plate glass, increased from 8 cents to 10 cents per square foot on sizes not exceeding 16 by 24 square inches, and on those above that and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches, from 10 cents to 12½ cents per square foot; all above that, 22½ cents per square foot, which is a reduction on nearly all of these larger sizes.

People interested in these schedules, both the makers of plate glass and the consumers who make furniture, came before the committee and asked for a flat rate of 22½ cents a foot on all sizes of plate glass. That would increase these lower sizes from 10 cents to 22½ cents and from 12 cents to 22½ cents, while it would decrease those more than 24 by 30 inches all the way from 38 cents per square foot to 22½ cents per square foot and, I think, on some of them from 50 cents per square foot to 22½ cents. Well, the committee looked into it. They found they were entitled to increased protection on these small sizes, and they added 25 per cent to the duty. They found that they can make the larger sizes without the protection in the Dingley bill, and so they decreased the duty. That is the principle on which we have framed this bill. Sometimes you see a man stand up and say, "I am a protectionist." I claim to have been a protectionist all my life. Still, I find some gentlemen who claim to be protectionists with whom I do not exactly agree. Some gentlemen think in order to be protectionists that after they have found out the difference between the cost of production here and the cost abroad they ought to put on double that difference by way of a tariff rate, and they are willing to vote for such a provision in the bill, and if crowded hard they will go to three times that amount.

I do not believe that such a man is a good friend of protection. I believe we should fix these duties as nearly as we can at the difference between the cost here and the cost abroad, and not after we have decided what that difference is, double it, add 100 per cent to it; because when that is done, that rate is pointed to as one of the inconsistencies and incongruities of a protective-tariff bill. He is the better friend of protection who tries to keep the rates reasonably protective to the people engaged in the industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, there are other changes. Pins with solid heads, the same rate of duty; but with ornamental heads, where they have diamonds and everything else hanging around the head, so that they get into the class of jewelry, we have increased the rate from 40 to 50 per cent ad valorem.

We increased the rate on some watch movements, after full and careful hearing; and I invite the attention of gentlemen of this committee on both sides to the hearings on the watch schedule. I believe those of us who believe in protection will think we did the right thing. I can not go into details now.

Those who believe in a tariff for revenue will also believe that we will produce more revenue under the schedules as we have made them than we did out of the schedules under the Dingley bill; and those who believe in a tariff for revenue, with one eye closed on the protective principles of the bill, will be enthusiastic in support of the changes that we have made upon watches. Oh, I do admire a man who comes up and says, "I am for a tariff for revenue, but my people are doing this or that down at my district, and they can not stand for the foreign competition." Take, for instance, peanuts, which come in at half a cent a pound. Gentlemen say they can not meet the competition unless you raise the duty 800 per cent and make it 4 cents a pound. Still they say, "We are for a tariff for revenue, but we want to protect the peanut industry." We talked some of changing this from half a cent per pound to half a cent a peanut. Of course that would be more in line with their tariff for revenue, and it would give them all the protection they want. [Laughter.] But, wisely, the committee after a considerable examination of the subject came to the conclusion that half a cent a pound was ample protection for the peanut industry of the United States, and they have left the rate just where it was.

Zinc in ore. That has been a burning question to some Members of the House and in some localities in the United States.

Zinc ore was never on the dutiable list until this proposed bill. There was never any necessity for it until within the last three or four years. None came in to interfere with the zinc miners of the United States. But three or four years ago the people up in Missouri, in the Joplin district, including the Kansas district and running through into Oklahoma, found out



that calamite was coming into the United States from Mexico and interfering with their industry. They posted hotfoot to the Treasury Department. Calamite was on the free list, but under the general clause relating to ores there was a duty of 20 per cent on zinc ore. They never had occasion to study it up before. The Treasury officials decided that inasmuch as calamite was more or less rich in zinc it should come in under a duty of 20 per cent, and they imposed it. Suits were commenced in several parts of the United States—in New York, in New Orleans, and elsewhere—to recover back the 20 per cent paid under protest, claiming that it should come in free.

As these suits came to trial, one by one, the United States was beaten, and the courts decided that it should come in free. Still the Government continued to collect the duty, hoping for a reversal in the higher courts, perhaps ultimately in the Supreme Court of the United States.

This is the rule of the Government in these cases, and you will see the necessity for it. If the Government should lay down on the collection of a duty when they had the first adverse decision, and then on appeal the court should finally determine that they were right in assessing and collecting the duty, the Government would have no redress against the people who, in the meantime, had imported ore; they would have to hunt for the money, and could not get it. And so they have continued to impose the duty and collect it on calamite up to the present time.

Still the ore came in in increasing quantities, and these people came down here and asked for a duty on the ore, and they wanted a cent and a half a pound. The committee took a good deal of time in the investigation to find out the truth about the matter. It was no easy matter to investigate.

These gentlemen came up, and with nothing but hearsay as to the price in Mexico of labor and cost of the production of the ore. When we came to pin them down, the information was not very accurate. In fact, one gentleman drew on his imagination, and testified before the committee that the Mexican ore had to be drawn by ox teams about 40 miles from the mines to the railroad. He said that a team of two or four oxen would draw 3 tons of that ore through a sandy road from the mine to the railroad. Some of us that had gee-hawed the oxen when we were boys knew something about what ox teams could do in drawing 3 tons of ore over a sandy road. We doubted that proposition and all his evidence. By and by some gentlemen who had the facts appeared before the committee and made a brief, in which they stated their case, and finally the committee concluded to put a cent a pound on the zinc contained in the ore—a cent a pound on the zinc in pigs and bars, the same as the duty on the ore. It may cost the difference of one-fifth of a cent to refine zinc in ore in this country from what it costs in Great Britain and it may not. The difference in price between New York and London has averaged about one-fifth of a cent a pound during the last ten or twelve years.

The truth is that over there they have cheaper labor, and here the smelters being located in the Kansas district, where there is natural gas, we have the cheaper fuel, and one about balances the other. Some of the refiners claim that the British have sort of inherited their adaptiveness to smelting because it has been handed down from father to son, and that they are a little more expert than our people who have only had their experience and have not come into it by the transmission of blood. Then the matter of freight, I think, cuts some little figure in it, but we concluded that, on the whole, it was better to put the same duty on the zinc in the ore and zinc in the pig, 1 cent a pound in each case. We think we have given them all the protection they are entitled to, both the miner and the refiner. We present that as one of the additional duties in this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will it interrupt the gentleman to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. It will interrupt, but it will be a pleasant experience to have an interruption.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is now claimed that the reduction made from a cent and a half to a cent a pound on zinc spelter leaves the zinc manufacturers open to a competition with the manufacturers of spelter in foreign countries that they can not stand. It is claimed that the Italian, the Belgian, and the German refiners of zinc spelter can import the ore from old Mexico, refine it in their countries, pay \$20 per ton duty, and supply it to our markets cheaper than our own manufacturers can make spelter here.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, in reply to that let me state this one concrete fact: Great Britain has been importing this old Mexico zinc ore and reducing it, smelting and refining it, importing it, of course, free of duty, and we have had a duty of a cent and a half a pound here on the pig. Notwithstanding that, as stated by one of the witnesses in behalf of the smelter

company, the difference in price between New York and London has been only one-fifth of a cent a pound in favor of London—one-fifth of a cent less during all these years. Now, he asks for an additional duty. He asks for a cent a pound duty, and he made it up in this way: There was a quarter of a cent because of the efficiency inherited from the grandfather who had been a smelter in Great Britain, as compared with the efficiency of the smelter here.

We did not consider that proposition very long. He added a quarter of a cent for contingencies which had not happened during the last twelve years, and we did not draw on our apprehension for that contingency. Then he asked eighteen one-hundredths of a cent for difference in freight, which did not exist on examination of it. In that way he claimed they ought to have a cent a pound, and he did not conjure up Belgium or Germany or anybody else, but he was talking about Great Britain, where his competition is; not Germany or Belgium. Of course, after this bill is published, gentlemen with those interests who have not followed the matter before will come to Members of the House and conjure up some bugbear, some ghost, and transfer its existence from Great Britain to Belgium or Germany.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The freight rate from Belgium is about 10 cents, and the freight rate from the Kansas smelter is 28½ cents to the seaboard markets. For this reason 1 cent a pound does not afford protection to the zinc-spelter manufacturer in this country.

Mr. PAYNE. Ten cents a what?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Ten cents a hundred.

Mr. SCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. PAYNE. I examined very carefully the gentleman's statement of the difference in freight. I did not find it there. I may have been wrong and he may have been right. I may have been a little prejudiced because he tried to work in this quarter of a cent for hereditary transmission in the smelter in Great Britain, or because he tried to work in the quarter of a cent for contingencies—laboring to make it a cent a pound, when he had to admit that the difference in price was only one-tenth of a cent; and he had done business here against freight rates and everything else, and the price here with this ample protection, and more than protection, upon the article had ruled only one-fifth of a cent more than the London price. Why, Mr. Chairman, there are some things that we get in statistics that can not be controverted. Facts are stubborn things when they are on the official reports, and when this same man came in here and had made the average of the difference in price for a number of years one-fifth of a cent a pound—and I was willing to go him a little better, because I discovered one year that it was almost two-fifths of a cent a pound—that was a concrete fact that he could not get over by any imagination or apprehension.

Mr. Chairman, if we made this bill on the apprehensions of people, there is no knowing where it would stop. Just now we are suffering from a depression in business, from a panic which was world-wide, and we have been having the effect of that panic since the fall of 1907. People abroad can not sell their goods as well as the people here. They are dumping them on us to get the money and keep their heads above water, selling them at lower than normal or average price for the last few years prior to 1907. We can not adjust a bill to meet just that panicky condition. We have got to take a reasonable view of the business for the years where it has been prosperous under the Dingley rate up to 1907. It ill becomes the man who is a smelter or a miner of zinc in ore to come in here and complain or criticise. On the contrary, I met one of these gentlemen this morning, and he took me by the hand and said:

I am from the Joplin district, and I want to thank the committee for the fair consideration which they gave to the zinc business.

Of course you can find somebody who is disgruntled always.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The duty on zinc spelter under the Dingley bill was a cent and a half a pound.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Under the Payne bill it is proposed to make it a cent a pound.

Mr. PAYNE. Just 1 cent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. A reduction of \$10 in the ton. Now, my contention is that the protection that is offered to the ore men by placing a cent a pound on the metallic contents of zinc in the ore—

Mr. PAYNE. I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. CAMPBELL (continuing). Is taken from them by removing the duty of half a cent a pound on the zinc spelter, because the larger importations which will come in the finished product from foreign countries will injure our mines and our smelters alike.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not go through all the small matters that are covered by increases in this bill—

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PAYNE. I do.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, representing the mining interests and the miners, that we have no contention to make in regard to the tariff that has been changed on spelter. The miners appreciate the fact that you have given a tariff of 1 cent a pound upon the metal contents in zinc ore, and we believe that we are entitled to that, and we are making no fight nor have we any fault to find in regard to the matter of tariff on spelter at present.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not comment on all the items we have changed in this bill. A number of them appear in the report, and the reason for them is so plain that it does not need comment, but if hereafter they are attacked when this bill is considered by paragraphs, I may have something to say upon them. We raised the duty on lithographic prints after a full hearing and careful consideration. Why, we found that Germany was making pictures for postal cards and supplying the United States. In my own town some ladies wrote me, wanting to know what the duty was on postal cards of the beautiful scenes around the most beautiful city in the world, "Auburn, sweet Auburn," and I wrote to know why, and they said that they were going to distribute a large number of those cards, and they found they could get them cheaper in Germany after paying the tariff than in the United States. So I started in, a little prejudiced by this testimony which had come to me, and I was not surprised to find that people who knew about the business stated the exact facts as to the need of additional protection in order that our people who work at the lithographic trade might have a chance to live and to do business, so we increased the amount to the protective point to make up the difference of cost here and in Germany. We hope that the result will be that the bulk of these photographic cards will be produced by the laborers in the United States and not by the laborers in Germany.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I do so with pleasure.

Mr. PERKINS. On page 52 of the bill, at paragraph 407, at the close of the section, there is a change of duty on plain basic papers used for photographic or solar processes. The duty there has been increased 50 per cent. Does the gentleman recall the reason for that at all, or recall that item?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not recall the evidence. There was a mass of evidence about the paper schedule, somewhat technical, and, while I understood it at the time, I do not recall it.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the gentleman this article is imported entirely from abroad. It is not manufactured in this country, and there seems no reason why the duty at 6 cents, which would average about 20 per cent ad valorem, should be largely increased; and the people who have to pay the tax, because there is no domestic manufacture, were curious to know on what theory the committee made so large an increase in the duty which they have to pay.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to state to my colleague that his friend and mine, the general counsel of the great photographing establishment of his own town, kept pretty close tab on this hearing and appeared before the committee.

I do not recall that he appeared and made any argument in answer to the argument that was made in favor of increasing these rates. I do not pretend to remember now the evidence. I would be glad to take it up with the gentleman later.

Mr. PERKINS. I would be glad if the gentleman would. The gentleman kept close tab on the evidence and is still surprised to find an increase made on this item. I hope the gentleman will take it up later.

Mr. PAYNE. I am always glad to take up any question with my colleague.

Now, in Schedule G, we increase the duty on split peas because of the personal knowledge and evidence of a Member of the House who knows all about the business. We did not give him what he asked for, but we did increase it 5 cents a bushel. On figs we made an increase of from 2 to 2½ cents a pound. On pineapples, from \$7 to \$8 per thousand.

On Schedule I we put an additional duty of 1 cent a yard on mercerized fabrics. Mercerized fabrics are something new to the trade. They are produced by saturating the cloth with some chemical compound and then stretching it and drying it. It produces a beautiful finish in the cloth that will almost deceive an ordinary man to believe it is silk. This was invented by a man named Mercer, and is called the "mercerized process."

The additional labor and the difference in the cost of labor here and abroad clearly showed that they were entitled to a cent a yard. Then, there is an increase of duty on stockings that are shaped on a machine to the conformation of the foot. We did it after hearing a good deal of evidence and after carefully considering it, and came to the conclusion that if we wished to continue the manufacture of our own ladies' hose we must give an additional protection to our manufacturers. So we increased this duty. I understand the ladies are forming an organization. I hope no Member of the House will be intimidated by any such organization. I hope they will be able to make their peace at home and abroad when this question is under discussion. I am sure they will if they will carefully study the evidence and present the arguments from the facts presented to the committee.

Now, the next thing, Mr. Chairman, was an increase of duty on women's gloves. And thereby hangs a tale! In 1897 we increased the duty on men's gloves from about \$2 a dozen pairs to \$4 a dozen pairs. They demonstrated to the committee that that would make up the difference in the cost of labor between this country and the countries abroad, and that they could make men's gloves here and take the principal share of the market if we put on that duty. The committee then considered the proposition carefully, after hearing all the evidence. We believed that they should have an increase of duty to \$4 a dozen on men's gloves. Then we were making perhaps 5 per cent of the men's gloves in this country and importing the balance. To-day we are making 90 per cent of the gloves worn by men in the United States and importing the 10 per cent. It transferred an industry, built up small cities and towns. People take these gloves to their homes, sew them by machinery and by hand. The fruit of their labor is sold to the people of the United States, and the price per pair of men's gloves to-day in the United States, they tell me, is less than it was when we put on this duty in 1897.

It is not quite as big in proportion, but as good an illustration of the benefits of protection as was the duty on tin plate put into the McKinley bill in 1890. Now they come to us and say that they are making about 5 per cent of the ladies' gloves in this country and importing 95 per cent. It is just as easy and just as difficult to make a lady's glove as it is to make a man's glove. The duty should be the same, and if it is made the same they promise to set 50,000 people at work and make the gloves for the women of the United States. So we put on this increase. A pretty large increase on one of the items is \$1.75 a dozen on schmaschen gloves. The schmaschen glove is made from the skin of a prematurely born kid. But there are so many schmaschen coming into the United States that it would seem almost as though all the kids in Europe had been born too early. [Laughter.] Of course it is a fraud. They get in a schmaschen glove that does not belong in the class, gloves that should pay \$2.50 and \$3 a dozen under the Dingley law. We wipe out that schmaschen business, and we put on a duty of \$4 a dozen on women's gloves, and where they were over 14 inches in length we added an additional duty for every dozen pairs. We did it to build up an industry. Women could get along without the kid gloves, or fewer pairs of them, use silk gloves and cotton gloves, and all that sort of thing.

They could keep their hands warm, although they could not cover their pride. So we increased that duty. We believe that when this bill becomes law and is in full operation and before it is repealed, we will be making 90 per cent of the women's gloves in this country.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman believes that this dollar and a half a dozen pairs will materially increase the price of women's gloves? That is the object, is it not?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, \$1.50 a dozen pairs would make 12½ cents a pair. Yes; in the first operation it would—that is, while we were having protection, increasing the price first as a benefit to the manufacturers, and then when competition comes in you get back to the old rates, just as we have on men's gloves, or below.

Mr. PERKINS. Then, as I understand, this duty is not intended as a means of increasing the revenue?

Mr. PAYNE. Fortunately, both meet in this schedule. It is beautiful for revenue and magnificent for business.

Mr. PERKINS. Then I understand that if we manufacture 90 per cent of the women's gloves that are used, instead of what we are doing now, there will be no importation, and the revenue on gloves will certainly be less. You can not both get the revenue and make the gloves without making the revenue less.



Mr. PAYNE. Well, we need the revenue now, right off, next year. The year after that we will not need so much of it, and before this bill is repealed I hope we will not need any from this source. That is a third good reason. I wish my colleague would ask me another question.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask my colleague if he really thinks if this duty is fixed so high, and the women's gloves which are now imported and pay duty are in the future made in this country and no women's gloves are imported, there will be an increased revenue made by the duty?

Mr. PAYNE. If in the initiation of the business I did not think there would be an increase in the revenue, I would hesitate. It will take some time to build up this business. But the gentleman knows that the ladies who wear these gloves will wear out just as many gloves and buy just as many next year as they do now if they do cost 15 or 25 cents a pair more than they do now.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. Will my colleague allow me to make a statement? I desire to make this statement—

Mr. PAYNE. I do not want my colleague to make a speech.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. I do not intend to make a speech, in the gentleman's time. I want to ask him this question: While the manufacture of gloves will be greater the importation of leather will be increased very much, and the revenue will not be so greatly changed as it would seem on the first statement of the case.

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad that my colleague made that statement. The duty on leather is 20 per cent. The question came here that we should take that off in order to encourage the manufacture of gloves. We found out that people were making leather here, and this leather is subject to a peculiar method of manufacture. It is "knee stretched." They take the leather and manipulate it over a human knee in order to make it, and of course that calls for manual labor, and that means the establishment of a factory for its production, and that 20 per cent is for an industry they have established in the past few years and which they hope to make a permanent industry of the United States.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I desire to ask the gentleman a question, not entirely germane to his recent remarks which were discussing gloves, but I want to get to liquor—whisky. I noticed in a paper some time ago the committee was diligently considering and possibly had determined to increase the tax on beer from \$1 to \$1.50 a barrel. Now, will the gentleman kindly state whether that was done?

Mr. PAYNE. I have no knowledge of the committee having in mind the question of changing the tax on beer in any manner, whether \$1 or \$2 or any other sum.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Would the gentleman tell us, if it was considered, why it was not increased? There was a good deal of demand for it.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Chairman, the tax on beer was an old tax, and had been in force for a good many years. When we had the Spanish war coming on and providing revenue for that war, we increased the tax from \$1 to \$2 per barrel, and we kept it there for a year or two, and they came around and complained that they were about to go into bankruptcy.

They took us into their confidence in regard to their balance sheets, and so forth. It seemed to us then, and it seems to the committee now, that that particular thing is taxed about all the business will bear. We were not making a prohibition bill. We were raising revenue. We must treat this matter not solely from a moral standpoint, but from a business standpoint, and it seemed that a dollar a barrel on the beer with the tax on the brewers and the wholesalers and the retailers and then the tax on the saloons, which in my State frequently, perhaps not generally, amounts to as much as \$1,000 a year, that this business was taxed about to its limit as a tax-producing business.

That is the reason why I was not in favor of raising the tax.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I asked the question in all good faith.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman is anxious to raise revenue, because revenue is very much needed at this time. The gentleman did increase the tax on ladies' stockings and on ladies' gloves, and it looked to me as though it might have been consistent to put a little more tax on beer, even if we drove it out of the country.

Mr. PAYNE. The difference is that the tax on stockings and the tax on gloves encourage industries. The tax on beer

might destroy some brewers and destroy the revenue. We are seeking revenue; we are not trying to enforce prohibition.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The increased tax on spices imported, I understand, was not for the purpose of protecting American manufacturers, but for the purpose of raising revenue.

Mr. PAYNE. Both.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I can not see the consistency of the difference in the two. I will say by the way, though I imagine that had nothing to do with it, that one reason I was provoked to ask this question was because the newspapers are full of suggestions, whether true or false I do not know, that the whisky interests had a large and strong lobby here in Washington.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I want to say to the gentleman that no man appeared before the committee asking that a tax be kept off beer or put on beer. The subject was not mentioned by anyone before the committee; and so far as I have been able to read the evidence, there is no brief asking either for an increased tax or against it, certainly not against it. So that the lobby did not appear either in that or in the liquor interests.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I accept the statement of the gentleman fully. It seems that there was no occasion for the lobby to appear before the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Of that fact the beer people had no more knowledge than had the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. In that connection I will ask the gentleman from New York what the purpose of the majority of the committee was in drafting this bill, in reducing the tariff on barley to 15 cents a bushel and on barley malt to 20 cents a hundred? Was not that in favor of the brewers, or was it intended for some other purpose?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, barley is an old subject to me. When we were forming the McKinley bill the duty on barley was 10 cents a bushel. There was some of it came in from Canada—quite a good deal of it as I remember—and most of it was imported into the State of New York, and there mixed with New York State barley, which was a little inferior in grade, and the malt made was sold to the brewers as first-quality Canadian malt. Three or four of those malt houses were located in my district.

The committee came to the subject of barley and increased the duty from 10 cents a bushel to 30 cents a bushel, which was about twice over prohibition of the importation of barley. They stopped raising barley in Canada. The malt houses in my district were broken up. A committee of citizens from the city of Oswego came down here in great force, with a great deal of moral force behind them, asking for the restoration of the duty on barley to 10 cents a bushel. I made the motion in the committee for 10, 15, and 20 cents. I could not get the committee to reduce it to either of those figures. We had an election soon after that, and the city where I had formerly had a thousand majority gave a majority against me of a thousand on the barley and malt question, so that that was burned into my memory. [Laughter.]

Now, some gentlemen came down here, went before the committee, and said they were going to argue for the reduction of the duty on barley. I told them of the trials that I had had formerly on this subject, but they went before the committee and made their argument. Some of them were people from Buffalo, N. Y. None of them were from my district. The people there have given up. The malt houses have been turned into something else, and the city is still living. It has not been in my district since the last time they cut me, so I don't know what they would do if I was running for office there now.

The committee heard these gentlemen, and a majority of the committee decided to reduce the duty on barley from 30 to 15 cents. Fifteen cents is perfectly high protection on barley. One statement was made, as I remember, possibly by a member of the committee, but outside of the meeting of the committee, that the duty on barley was out of proportion to every other duty in the farm schedules. It reduces it 15 cents, and while it will still be high it will be in proportion to the duty on wheat and oats.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it not true, that while the duty is out of proportion the farmers are not receiving the price for barley that they ought to receive?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know why the farmer does not get the price he ought to receive, for none is coming in from any foreign country. He has no competition, except among ourselves. If he is not receiving what he ought to receive I do not know why. These gentlemen that appeared before the committee said that the farmer and the elevator man out in the gen-

tleman's vicinity were getting outrageously big prices. I do not know, as I have no personal knowledge of it. Barley dropped out of my recollection, notwithstanding it had been burned in, until these gentlemen appeared before the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. A year ago there was considerable barley imported from Canada into the United States.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. POU. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact and then ask him a question based upon it: The gentleman from New York is well aware that the duty on men's gloves is almost prohibitive. I do not think that proposition will be controverted.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that he will remember that Mr. Littauer, who appeared before the committee, said that the importations were greater now than a year before the duty was put on. I have not examined it.

Mr. POU. There has been some increase in the importation of men's gloves, but the committee has seen fit to increase the rate on women's gloves until the ad valorem duty is even higher than on men's gloves. For instance, on gloves of over 14 inches in length the ad valorem duty has been increased from 58 per cent to 132 per cent.

Now, if the present duty on men's gloves is practically prohibitive, I would like for the gentleman from New York to explain why there is such a large increase in the duty on women's gloves.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman from North Carolina was not present when I was trying to answer the question of my colleague, Mr. PERKINS. I explained to him by saying that it was to build up that industry in this country, an industry from which we might get a revenue. These two facts met and we were glad to put on a duty. My colleague suggested that the revenue might be large for the first few years and finally cut down, and that suggested to me a third reason for imposing the duty, that we would get a revenue at once, and before the ten years comes around and business is good, I think, if the bill is still in force, we will get revenue enough.

Mr. POU. Does the gentleman insist that an ad valorem duty on gloves under 14 inches in length, which are those most universally used, would be a revenue-producing duty?

Mr. PAYNE. Most certainly. The gentleman talks as if women were not going to wear any more gloves. I want to say to the gentleman, and I have explained it at length, that the large duty is on the schmaschen gloves, and we do not care if no more are imported—they are a fraud.

Mr. POU. The increase is all the way down the line, and schmaschen gloves are increased from \$2.50 to \$4 a dozen.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from New York allow a suggestion?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In regard to barley, about which the gentleman was asked a question, the importation of barley has steadily decreased during the last ten years, and in 1907 only \$6,000 worth was imported at an ad valorem rate of over 60 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad the gentleman has that book. That was my recollection about it, and if the gentleman from North Dakota will study the statistics he will find out that the duty is prohibitive.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say that at that time they were paying a dollar a bushel for barley in this country.

Mr. PAYNE. And still none of it came in.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the gentleman advocates the old-fashioned Republican theory that a duty shall be equal to the difference in the cost of production. Does the gentleman claim that it requires \$4 a dozen to measure the difference between the cost of gloves in this country and abroad?

Mr. PAYNE. I do, based on the evidence that appeared before the committee. I have no personal knowledge of it any more than the gentleman has.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Would the gentleman advocate a prohibitive duty on gloves?

Mr. PAYNE. No, sir.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is there enough difference between the two prices to establish the industry in the country?

Mr. PAYNE. That was the evidence before the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And the committee had full hearings on that, did it?

Mr. PAYNE. Everybody who wanted to appeared. I do not know that many men appeared, but the hearings were commenced early, and were published. I want to say this about the hearings: We published every morning the hearings of the day before, and we mailed over 2,500 copies, which were sent out to the merchants, mechanics, and manufacturers of the United States. If any merchant or manufacturer saw anything in these hearings that did not agree with his views, we heard from him. Our view was to open up a discussion by publicity. This thing has not been done in a corner. It has been done in the open and it is all aboveboard. Everybody had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. POU. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POU. I would ask the gentleman if he still insists that this large increase in the duty on women's gloves will be a revenue producer? I see that the gentleman has not only calculated it as a revenue producer here, but he has made it increase the revenue. I would ask him in view of that fact how could such increase possibly operate to protect the glove manufacturer in this country, if the same quantity of gloves still comes in?

Mr. PAYNE. I will make that clear to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. They can not establish this industry in a minute or in a year or fully in five years. Until it is established these gloves must come in. People are going to wear gloves, notwithstanding the gloves cost them 25 cents more a pair. They will come in, and we will still get an increase in the revenue, because we will get \$4 instead of \$2.50 or \$3.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I have just figured up the difference between the importations of men's and women's gloves. Out of a total of 14,000,000 pairs of gloves imported last year over 13,000,000 pairs were women's gloves. It is only a question of whether we want that business in this country or whether we want to leave it where it is. If you put the same duty on that you have on men's gloves, you will do the work here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, that seems to be pretty fully established, and I hope there will be enough men in the House to take the side of the American mechanic and the American woman who takes these gloves—men's gloves—to her home and sews them, so that we may give more of them an opportunity to earn a livelihood at the American wage rate and transfer this industry in women's gloves from other countries to the United States.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am fully in harmony with the statement that the gentleman has made as to his attitude on the glove schedule, that the rate ought to be raised. I do not want to get him away from that subject, but there occurs to me at this time another article, to wit, shingles. I find from an examination of the report that we are importing 329 times as many shingles per year from Canada into the United States as we export to Canada. Now, then, if it is desired to equalize the protective forces of this country by increasing the revenues in relation to the glove schedule, why would it not be an excellent idea to raise the tariff on shingles from about 30 cents to about 60 cents a thousand?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, there may be other reasons for raising the duty on shingles, but I would not be for raising it simply because we imported 329 shingles from Canada where we sent 1 over there. I do not deem that a sufficient reason for increasing the duties, and I have not acted on that principle.

Mr. CUSHMAN. If the gentleman will allow me to make one more statement, during this particular time when they were importing three hundred and twenty-nine times as many shingles into our country as we were sending into theirs, the shingle mills in my State, the home of the red-cedar shingle, were idle on an average of about five months in a year.

Mr. PAYNE. When was that?

Mr. CUSHMAN. During the last two years.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Always have been, for several years.

Mr. PAYNE. No; they have not.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Yes; that condition has been for several years.

Mr. PAYNE. The evidence before the committee was that there were more importations during the last two years than previous years. Why? Because goods were low the world over. Nobody appeared to be buying except the United States, and they not in their usual quantities, and the manufacturers



abroad were forced to dump their produce over here in order to find a market. I ask the gentleman to take his lumber schedule from beginning to end and inquire whether the importation of American lumber to neutral markets in the Pacific has not increased by leaps and bounds beyond the importation of British Columbia lumber on the Pacific coast, and whether he can formulate an argument out of that for an increased duty on shingles. He can do that at his leisure.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from New York to say that the imports of barley had decreased. Well, I have it right before me that in 1907 there was sent into this country 37,000 bushels; in 1908, 198,118 bushels.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know what the gentleman has before him, but my colleague from Ohio read from the book Duties and Imports, which was prepared at the instance of the committee and under their direction, and in which I have not yet found a mistake.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. This is the very latest; I got it this morning: Imports of Merchandise into the United States, by the Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I will give the gentleman a little additional information on the barley question, if he will listen to me.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I will, with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. PAYNE. In 1898 we imported 104,000 bushels; in 1899, 110,000 bushels; in 1901, 178,000; in 1902, 57,000; in 1903, 50,000; in 1904, 88,000; in 1905, 79,000; in 1906, 10,000—I omit fractions, but it was about 11,000; in 1907, 11,815 bushels. That is the history, and the gentleman can draw his own inference.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes. Is it on barley?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I notice in the list of reductions barley is reduced from 30 to 15 cents a bushel. Barley, I understand—I know nothing about it—is largely used in the manufacture of beer.

Mr. PAYNE. I guess almost exclusively.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Some gentleman suggested it takes about 5 bushels of barley to make a barrel of beer.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not believe 5 bushels of barley ever went into 1 barrel of beer.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Hence this reduction of 15 cents per bushel on barley enables the beer manufacturer to make his beer about 75 cents a barrel cheaper than under the Dingley bill.

Mr. PAYNE. That is all moonshine.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. In view of that, ought not you to put a little greater—

Mr. PAYNE. I do not believe that the barley duty proposed in this bill has got below the prohibitive point of barley coming in here. I do not believe the additional coming in here will hurt the American market or the American farmer, and I do not believe the man who makes beer will get a market any cheaper.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is this a reduction to protect the American farmer or the beer manufacturer?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, there has not been any reduction from the American farmer—that is not going to do him any hurt. The schedule remains about where it is. You gentlemen, every man of you—if there is a man on that side who has not done it, let him stand up and say so—has gone on the stump and said these duties were prohibitive; that they did not need any such duties, and they were put in and held out as a sop to the American farmer. Have you not done so?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have so charged and I believe it now—

Mr. PAYNE. Why are you whining about it now?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I believe this talk of protection to the products of the American farmer is a fraud, a sham, and a pretense. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. I never saw the like of the agility with which you gentlemen can get on both sides of the rail at the same time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Not on both sides, but we want to get you on the other side a little bit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. If the gentleman will allow me, returning to the schedule of lumber, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he has reduced the tariff on lumber for the purpose of increasing the revenue or for the purpose of conserving our forests or for the purpose of reducing the price of lumber to the consumer?

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I will get to the discussion of the lumber in due order. I was only switched off by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN]. I do not want to take it up now, if the gentleman will allow me, because I will get a little mixed as to some things I desire to say. Now, I am not going through all the various reductions in duty in the chemical schedule. I should think two-thirds of the paragraphs have been reduced on the chemical schedule as it appears here on this bill. I want to say a word here about ad valorem as they appear. In paragraph 1 there are six or eight articles, and we made a positive cut on more than one-half of them. The rest of them we have left where they were. We transferred oxalic acid to that paragraph, and we find that instead of showing a lower ad valorem rate on goods coming in in paragraph 1 than under the Dingley bill, that it is increased 24 per cent. Now, we made a positive reduction on four or five articles, but we transferred oxalic acid to that list, with a duty of 25 per cent, and made this increase in the equivalent ad valorem. Part of it may be due to the clerk who made it not being familiar with the price of oxalic acid and getting it too low.

I do not know how that is. And part of it may be due to the German machine that we use for dividing and multiplying. I am suspicious of German machines, especially when they get at our tariff bill, because they have played havoc with some of the schedules in regard to the equivalent ad valorem, as gentlemen will find when they get the books showing them in detail. On the whole, of the dutiable articles in this bill the increase in the ad valorem is about 1½ per cent, coming about in this way—the things we have transferred from the free to the dutiable list. They figured nothing in the Dingley law. In this they figure the full duty we put upon them, and then the increases that we have made on such articles as gloves, perfumeries, fancy soaps, and things of that kind. And the things we have transferred from the free list to the dutiable list are some oils and some spices, and matters of that kind, as it is claimed they should pay a revenue duty. So we have put them on there. It shows the utter fallacy of trying to figure on anything like that. One of these days we will have a complete figure of equivalent ad valorem on all goods imported in 1906 under this bill and under the other. And then gentlemen can make their comparisons in the privacy of their offices as to what the effect is.

Well, we reduced the duty on boracic acid from 5 to 2 cents a pound. By the way, I have a document sent to me this morning by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], which I got an hour or two before I took the floor. I think he says something about this schedule, and I would judge from the tone of his remarks that he considered it a pretty fair schedule on the whole, made up on scientific principles. It shows that the gentleman from Missouri can once in a while appreciate a good thing when he sees it. When he got down to Schedule C, his vision was turned in the wrong direction as to very many items. He did not seem to realize what we had done in respect to Schedule C, and still we have left every paragraph of it where business will proceed and prosper, because we have not taken away their protection. He says that there are a dozen or more articles left in the bill on which the rates are prohibitive under the Dingley law, allowing very little of importation, raising practically no revenue, and noticeable among these are rivets. He says the duty on rivets has remained the same. We have changed it from 2 cents a pound to 1½ cents a pound. Still, this is a paragraph that he is complaining about for containing the same duty. There is a new grade of rivets used in the wheels of automobiles to keep them from skidding, and that are of a high grade of manufacture, with turned-up heads, and all that sort of thing, and on which we have put an ad valorem rate of duty.

The revenue officials were holding that they were dutiable at 45 per cent, and we have put them in at 45 per cent ad valorem. When you consider that an automobile is a fair subject of revenue, we should keep the duty 45 per cent. We were willing that people should have automobiles, even of foreign make, if they only pay Uncle Sam enough in the way of taxes on the importation of them. So we made the duty on those rivets correspond to the duty on automobiles. If he will turn to paragraph 143, bolts and bolt blanks, and so forth, he will find that we have lowered these duties from a cent and a half to a cent and a quarter a pound.

Then he speaks of nails. We reduced the duty on cut nails from six-tenths to five-tenths cent per pound, from 6 cents to 5 cents on wire nails. On spikes we have reduced the duty from 1 cent to one-half a cent, paragraph 161. On paragraph 162—tacks—we have reduced the duty from 1½ cents to five-eighths of a cent—cut it in two. Then, on hooks and eyes, he

says that we have kept the same rate, yet we have reduced the duty from 5½ cents and 15 per cent ad valorem to 4 cents and 15 per cent ad valorem. We have taken off a quarter of the duty. Nothing will satisfy our friends over there.

Now, the suggestion is made in this report that we could get together and we could possibly agree. How can you agree with a minority who will not agree to the interpretation of the language of the bill, or they would not make such an egregious error as that; and of course my friend will correct this mistake that he made, because I know he will want to go down to history as truthful and not as a mistaken man. And he says of the metal schedule:

It is apparent from a careful reading of this schedule that in those cases where the interest of the manufacturer of high-grade material demands a cut a reduction has been made, in cases like steel rails. Where the eyes of the country were watching to see what would be done, an apparent reduction has been made, but in very many cases in this schedule it is as radically a prohibitive tariff as it was in the beginning, and the changes in the schedule will undoubtedly not materially increase the revenues.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I could not understand what you said when you said that I had made such an egregious error. If there is any mistake, I do not understand what it was.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, tacks, nails, and several other things. You will find it all in my remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but the trouble is when will I find your remarks?

Mr. PAYNE. If I get off the floor in any sort of season, I will try to have them in the Record to-morrow, and if not, as soon as I can.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it that you say I have made an egregious error in—a statement of fact, or what?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman has got the bill there. If he will refer to paragraphs 165, 143, 158, and 160—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Paragraphs of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is a misstatement of fact, I want to correct it.

Mr. PAYNE. I want the gentleman to correct it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If what you are talking about is a misstatement of conclusion, I refuse to change it an iota.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman can do anything he pleases. I am calling it to the attention of the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You had three months to fix up your bill and report, and there were only four days given us to examine the bill and fix up our report; and if it should turn out that there are some mistakes in our report that would not be a very wonderful performance. What was it?

Mr. PAYNE. Have you a pencil?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have a friend here who is noting it.

Mr. PAYNE. Paragraph 165, rivets; paragraph 143, bolts; 158 and 160, nails; 161, spikes; 162, tacks; 178, hooks and eyes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that is the mare's nest, is it?

Mr. PAYNE. That comprises a majority of the articles the gentleman criticises in that schedule.

While I am up, I may as well talk a little about these views of the minority. They say there is a joker in the coffee business. I would like to find if there is a joker somewhere in the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, it is as plain as the nose on a man's face.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me call the gentleman's attention—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You are standing up there propounding questions like Anadasis Klotz to the universal world—

Mr. PAYNE. I am not propounding any question to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (continuing). And I am ready to answer.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman can answer me when he makes his speech. Let me make my statement and then answer. We can not both of us make the speech.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thought you were asking me a question.

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all. No. [Laughter.] I was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Chair did not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I do not think the Chair is seriously impeached. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can get at this a minute. They say there is a joker in paragraph 533 as to coffee. Coffee is placed on the free list; but there is a proviso as to coffee, and what is it? That whenever any country levies an export tax on coffee that we will levy an import tax equal to the amount on the coffee exported. Well, that is not a new thing in a tariff bill. It has been there before, and it will

appear in other tariff bills. Why, when the McKinley bill was reported a gentleman whom the gentleman from Missouri is fond of quoting, putting in the mouth of Mr. Blaine words that he suggests as the argument of a free trader, Mr. Blaine said that the McKinley bill was a bad bill; "it would not make a market for a barrel of pork or a pound of beef." Congress had a long time before thrown away the duty on coffee. I think it was in 1871 that was reported, or somewhere about then. Immediately Brazil and other countries levied an equal amount of export tax on coffee coming to this country, and so the talk about the free breakfast table was taken up—that the poor man was paying the same for his coffee that he paid before—and the duty went into the treasury of Brazil and did not go into the Treasury of the United States.

Well, coffee has remained on the free list from that day to this. And what are the facts? If they correctly appeared before this committee, Brazil is now levying an export duty of forty-seven one-hundredths of a cent upon every pound of coffee exported to the United States. We are paying that, and it is added to the price of the coffee, and we are paying that toward the support of the Brazilian Government. Some South American republics are putting on a larger export tax even than that. We propose to meet them on that ground and say to them that whatever the amount of their export tax we will put the same amount as an import tax. We will double it, and we will get half of it and they will get the other half.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not that mean in plain, every-day English that the American consumer of coffee will be paying both taxes?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, I will come to that before I get through. I would have come to it if the gentleman had not interrupted me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I could not tell. I do not know the operations of the gentleman's mind.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, there are some countries that do not levy an export tax. They are rivals of Brazil. They do not produce as much coffee as Brazil. They do not export as much to the United States. If they can get in here forty-seven one hundredths of a cent a pound cheaper than Brazil can, then, unless Brazil cuts off her export tax, the exporters of coffee in Brazil will be paying on their coffee to get into this market forty-seven one hundredths of a cent to the Government of Brazil and forty-seven one hundredths of a cent to the Government of the United States, or ninety-four one hundredths of a cent, while the other countries will have no export tax and will not have to pay any duty to the United States. That is all the joker there is in this paragraph—a plain business proposition. We propose, if we let coffee free into the United States, by proper legislation, to compel those countries to export it free into the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It does not satisfy us that whatever is levied on the export is to go to the Brazilian treasury. We are not going to sit down and shut our eyes to the situation and holler at somebody, but we are going to try to meet it by a business proposition. "If you want your coffee to come in here free, you do the square thing by the people of the United States and export it free," and that is all the joker there is in this proposition. We do not rely on getting a dollar of revenue out of Brazilian coffee or any other coffee under this paragraph. We expect that every duty will be taken off.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I find that coffee is quoted at 5 and 6 cents a pound. After that the 1-cent export duty charged by Brazil brings it up to 7 cents a pound. When you or I go to the market, we have to pay 30 to 35 cents or 40 cents a pound. Will the gentleman tell me where that difference goes and whether it would not be possible to levy a duty upon coffee—

Mr. PAYNE. The subject of the profit of the middleman upon coffee is a very interesting subject. All the way from the producer to the gentleman whom my friend from Illinois so fervently describes as the ultimate consumer, they all take a toll from it, and in some way coffee which is introduced into this country at 8½ cents a pound gets to the consumer at 35 cents a pound. Who does the milking and where the profit goes I never yet have been able to find out, and I do not see how we could regulate it by law if we did. We can fix the duty, that is all. We can not compel a man when he imports an article at 8 cents a pound to sell for 10 or 15 or 20 or prohibit him from selling it at 35 cents. He is in business not for his health, but to make money.

And it is true that there are some excuses in some cases for these large profits. Where a man does not sell more than a couple pounds of coffee a day, even if he makes 25 cents a pound, he is not getting exceedingly rich out of that particular business. Where they sell large quantities they are able to



build more palatial stores and they do not crush out the little fellows.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Evidently there is a profit of about 300 per cent. I wondered whether it would not be possible for some of that profit to go into the Treasury of the United States without increasing the cost to the consumer.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, a tax on coffee is a subject that can be approached from many directions. If we needed the duty and had no other resource, for one I would not hesitate to put the tax on it; but I think I have demonstrated that this bill will raise sufficient revenue without putting a tax on coffee, and therefore I am not in favor of it for that reason.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the gentleman talking about green coffee coming in at 8½ cents, while roasted coffee costs 25 cents? I buy good green coffee for 14 cents. Of course, if you roast it, it will increase the cost.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that I do not want to spend much time on this coffee question. Of course it is a green coffee that comes in as a general thing, for if it comes in roasted it is apt to get damp and spoil.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I want to make the suggestion that when we passed the pure-food law requiring coffee, like other articles, to be labeled correctly, if labeled at all as to the place of origin, people who had been selling mocha and java coffee which came from Brazil ceased doing that, and in order to get the higher price, put on fancy names, and nearly all the coffee which gentlemen in this body buy, instead of buying plain rio coffee, is in packages under fancy names, although it is the same coffee, and they pay for the name. As long as people like to pay for names they will continue to do it. The same coffee can be bought in the market and the stores, under the proper name for it, at a very much less price.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to discuss many of the reductions made in the bill seriatim, but I have had so many interruptions and have digressed so much that I see that I have been on the floor an unconscionable length of time, and I dislike to trespass on the time of the committee any longer. [Cries of "Go ahead!" "Go ahead!"]

Mr. HINSHAW. Talk about lumber.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, we have put iron ore on the free list after full consideration by the committee. I do not think I will go into that in detail, but I want to say that the evidence of Judge Gary, president of the United States Steel Company, was that in the production of pig iron 2 tons of our iron would go as far as 3 tons of the iron imported from across the sea; and that is true also of the Nova Scotia iron, they yielding about 40 per cent and ours about 60 per cent. Of course while that is true, it follows that there would be no occasion or necessity of a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore.

They have discovered some mines in northern Cuba, which are not largely developed, where there is a larger per cent of iron, amounting to in the vicinity of 50 per cent as against 60 per cent of our ores in the State of New York in the Champlain district. That presents a clear question of competition, because 5 tons of our ore will go as far as 6 tons of theirs, or in that vicinity. So that there is not so great a difference, because of the difference in the richness of the ore.

Our New York State ores are largely hard ores that are necessary in mixing with softer ores in the making of pig iron. They are absolutely essential. I want to say right here that if there is anybody in the United States that has a right to complain over the ore duty it is the owners of the mines in my own State, and I think they have no right to complain. I satisfied myself of that before I agreed to this provision of free ore. Under our treaty with Cuba their ores are to come in with a reduction of 20 per cent, which means, of course, 32 cents a ton.

Mr. Wetherbee, a most intelligent and worthy gentleman, one of the citizens of the highest character of our State, living in the northern part of it some distance from my district, a man whom I have known for many years, came before the committee and stated that they could stand a reduction still further of the duty on iron ore, but he did not think they could stand a reduction to a free-ore basis. After we had had these statements in the committee, I wrote a letter to Mr. George Otis Smith, of the Geological Survey, and got the records of that survey as to the richness of ores, both foreign and domestic, and made a careful comparison of his statement and of the statement presented by this gentleman, and I found that they agreed as to the richness of the ores.

Now, the importation of iron ore has been, on an average, about a million tons a year for a good many years, with a tariff of 40 cents a ton. After the Cuban treaty, reducing the ores from Cuba to 32 cents, by reason of the 20 per cent reduction, the importations from Cuba increased to about half a million tons a year, while those from foreign countries decreased about half a million tons a year, showing, as was stated by some gentleman acquainted with this business, that the business required an importation of this large amount of ore for some reasons which he gave that I do not remember, and confirming him in this respect, because when Cuban ores came in at a lower rate of duty they were enabled to drive out a half million tons of foreign ores and take their place in the market of the United States.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, as to the Spanish ores, it used to be claimed in Tennessee that Spanish ores brought over as ballast practically paid no freight—came practically free of freight.

Mr. PAYNE. The evidence was that freight cost all the way from \$1.50 even up to \$2.50 a ton, but as to Spanish ores, no one has any reason to fear anything from them. They are a very low-grade ore. Three tons of them will not go as far as 2 tons of our ore. No one has any reason to fear anything from the Spanish ores.

The only active competition that can come, in my judgment, in any event is from Cuba, and those mines have not yet been sufficiently developed so that you can say to a certainty that they will be a factor in the way of competition. So the committee, after review of all the evidence in the case, and careful review because this is a great subject, came to the conclusion that iron ore should go on the free list.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that iron ore that is imported from Cuba is owned by the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiary companies?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think that was proved. I think Judge Gary was asked the question as to whether he would not buy, and he said they were in the market for all the ore beds they could buy at a reasonable price; but I do think that there is some evidence that Mr. Schwab's company has some interest in Cuba.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact, as shown by the evidence before the committee, that the imported iron ore is used simply on the Atlantic coast, and that to take off the tariff will not decrease the price of iron products to the consumer, but will be giving the revenue to certain furnaces in New England on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. PAYNE. It can not get very far into the interior, of course, because it is so heavy and freight is so high.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not the fact that the proof before the committee was that the taking off of this duty will not reduce the price of iron or the products thereof to the consumer, but will be practically giving this revenue to those furnaces that are favored?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I think there was some such evidence as that, I will say in answer to the gentleman's question, because I want to give the gentleman full credit for what he has done in the committee and say that he has all the time been solicitous about the revenue, and if there was an opportunity to cut a duty his first inquiry was whether, under the cut rates, we would get as much revenue as we would without the cut. I think it is due to the gentleman to state that.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I want to ask if, as a matter of fact, the taking off of the revenue in this particular case does not amount only to giving that revenue to these certain furnaces? Is it not a fact that that amounts to about half a million dollars a year?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman can argue that out with himself.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. But I want to ask the gentleman about it.

Mr. PAYNE. If we collect \$200,000 on iron ore some one must pay it. The gentleman's theory has ever been that it was the ultimate consumer that paid that duty. I do not know whether he still holds to that or not.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is not this a special case, and do not the facts show that this action could not reduce the price of iron because it affects only certain furnaces at certain points, and that in this particular case it is a gift of that much revenue to these furnaces, and taking that much from the Treasury? That is the proposition I am asking the gentleman about.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman another proposition that may not have occurred to him.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would be glad to hear the gentleman answer my question first.

Mr. PAYNE. And that is this: The gentleman was solicitous about the steel trust for some reason or other in the hearings, and there has been some fear in some quarters that the steel trust might ultimately drive the smaller concerns out of business. Some of the smaller concerns are located near the Atlantic seacoast—the Pennsylvania Steel Company at Sparrows Point; and perhaps this company is at more disadvantage than some of the others who are manufacturing iron and steel goods. If they can get their iron ore a little cheaper on account of the taking off of this duty, it would strengthen that company and help them to keep on in the uneven race which it has with the great concern, the United States Steel Company.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. But, Mr. Chairman, how can that happen when the tariff is taken off ore that belongs to the steel trust?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, if I have not made it plain to the gentleman, I despair, and will have to give it up. Now, Mr. Chairman, the next article on which we reduced the duty was pig iron; but before I pass from iron ore, I want to say that Judge Gary testified that twelve years ago the royalty per ton was 10 cents; that he figured the royalty now at 40 cents a ton, and that went on into all his computations when he was figuring the profits on various articles of manufacture manufactured by the steel company.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me right there—

Mr. PAYNE. I wish the gentleman would let me finish this remark and then I will yield. Now, Mr. Chairman, he said in addition to that that they had just entered into a contract with the Great Northern Railroad Company to take a certain quantity of iron ore out of the beds, or at least to pay for the same or provide for its payment at 85 cents a ton for the first-year royalty; that they were to pay interest at 4 per cent on the price of this quantity of iron ore at 85 cents a ton, increasing the price from year to year until it got up to \$2 a ton.

I understand also there is a clause in that contract by which Mr. Gary can revoke it at the end of a certain time and need not stand by it during the period of its existence. There is a feeling on the part of people who control ore beds to keep up the price of the royalty. It is a great advance from 10 to 40 cents a ton in ten or twelve years, a difference of 300 per cent, and those gentlemen do not like to give up the amount of royalty. They are fearful they may have to give up part of it if we take off the duty of 40 cents a ton, and yet the question comes whether it is not right for the American people to have some consideration in that regard. Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman that if Judge Gary's statement will bear the construction that he puts upon it that it is absolutely misleading. I have lived in the iron district for thirty-six years. I have drawn probably more leases for ore than any man living in that district. Long before twelve years ago those leases were frequently drawn at 75 cents a ton royalty. I only know of one instance where as low as 10 cents was given, and that was on a low-grade ore, very difficult to reach. The average royalty, aside from this astounding contract for the Hill land, is not higher clear through the entire iron region than it was twelve or fourteen years ago, and averages about 30 cents. I myself, before the organization of the steel company, have paid as high as 75 cents royalty; and if the gentleman is drawing any conclusions from that statement they must be wrong, and I wish to say right here—

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman would not take up all of my time—

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Oh, no; but just one moment—

Mr. PAYNE. Go ahead.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I wish to say right here that I think that Judge Gary's statement was based upon the fact that during the panic years following 1893 the old Carnegie company did buy—not lease, but bought—some ore lands which turned out to be about on a basis of 10 cents per ton, there being much more ore than the parties who sold them supposed there was, they being at that time in financial stress.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, all I have to say is, Judge Gary made that statement under oath, and I do not know whether he is mistaken or not.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. I wish to ask whether that is supposed to cover depreciation of the ore land put down at the rate of 40 cents per ton—

Mr. PAYNE. Why, Judge Gary stated that as the royalty. There was another charge which went in there, which I do not now remember.

Mr. HOBSON (continuing). And whether this applies to the ore lands which the steel company owns and which it has capitalized at something like \$900,000,000?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I do not know whether it applies to their lands, and I do not know whether they were capitalized at \$900,000,000 or \$900,000,000,000; it does not change the value of it.

Mr. HOBSON. Combining the two, will the gentleman allow me to state—

Mr. PAYNE. I will answer any questions if I can, but I must object to gentlemen interjecting speeches here.

Mr. HOBSON. It is only one minute, and part of the question. That allowing 40 cents per ton for depreciation of the land, and 30 cents per ton for royalty on the total output for the next sixty years, for which they have estimated, and allowing 6 per cent interest, this alone would be the equivalent of about four billions of dollars at the end of the sixty years.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, is the gentleman content?

Mr. HOBSON. My question has not been answered.

Mr. PAYNE. I have answered that question.

Mr. HOBSON. It has not been answered as to whether it applied to their land or to land—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, who has the time? I tried to say to the gentleman that I had answered his question. If he has another question, and not a speech to make, I will answer the question if I can.

Mr. HOBSON. The question is whether Judge Gary ought to be allowed 30 cents a ton royalty for mining his own ore, and whether in addition he ought to be allowed 40 cents a ton for the depreciation of the land.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman asks me that question, I think not.

Mr. HOBSON. That will appear later as part of the basis for opposing the reductions made upon their products.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, coming to pig iron, from 1902 to 1906, both inclusive, the Bureau of Corporations in the Department of Commerce and Labor received reports from seven iron and steel companies in the United States which produced 93 per cent of the entire output. They were allowed to examine the books as well as the reports of these steel corporations, and to employ experts. They made a thorough examination. Judge Gary said that his company was first to yield to this examination, and that the examiners had every facility. The result was that the average cost of pig iron in these furnaces, producing 93 per cent of it in the United States, was \$14.01 a ton. Judge Gary also said that his company could produce pig iron a dollar per ton cheaper than the outsiders, and he did not know but more than that; perhaps \$2. So that would make the cost as being from \$13 to \$13.50 a ton, an increase of cost proportionately to the outside companies.

The committee will notice that this was during five of our prosperous years under the Dingley tariff, not boom years like 1907, but five prosperous years, that the pig iron cost \$14.01 per ton. Judge Gary figured that from 1908 down to the present time the cost was a little more than that—\$14.75 to \$15 a ton. In that he put 40 per cent depreciation for ore property, put in profits on hauling, profits on manufacturing coke, and, of course, profits all along the line, until he got down to the final cost of his pig iron.

Mr. Schwab, of the Bethlehem Steel Company, who appeared to be a very frank and fair witness before the committee, made his cost of pig iron \$14.19 a ton, or less than Judge Gary made it. We had some estimates from these gentlemen about the cost of pig iron abroad, mentioning one or two districts where pig iron had been produced as low as \$9—perhaps \$9.75—a ton. And I think Judge Gary is, perhaps, the only witness that mentioned this. But, fortunately, through the efforts of this committee and the efforts of the Department of Commerce and Labor, Mr. George M. Pepper, well known to many of the older Members of the House, formerly a newspaper correspondent and a bright, well-informed man, was sent to Germany to study the iron and steel industry.

He went to the two best districts in Germany, the Dortmund district and the Luxemburg district, and in a report which I have here, which is available to the Members of the House, he made up the cost of pig iron. In the Dortmund district it was from \$13.57 a ton to \$14.28 per ton. In the Luxemburg district from \$12.38 to \$13.61 per ton. And I will say to the Members of the House that an average of this would be about \$14.01 per ton, with the seven companies, for the period of five years. It would be only slightly less than the amount placed by Mr. Schwab on the cost of his pig iron, namely, \$14.19, in Germany, at the furnace, inland, with the inland freight and the ocean freight to be paid. Judge Gary says that the freight to New York from these districts—I am not sure whether he said



from the inland districts or from the ocean carriage; my impression is from the districts, and I will so state it—was \$2.85 per ton, which would seem to give our people a mighty good show for competition with a reduction of duty from \$4 to \$2.50 per ton. So we cut the duty from \$4 to \$2.50 per ton. Judge Gary was asked the question whether, if the duty was taken off of pig iron, it would bring any more foreign pig iron into the United States. He said that while that entered somewhat the realm of prophecy, he thought it would be much more profitable for the foreign countries to manufacture pig iron into steel and iron products than it would to sell it even at an advance to the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. In pig iron I see that there is a spread made between the duty on pig iron and scrap iron.

Mr. PAYNE. I am just coming to that.

Mr. HOBSON. Before the gentleman leaves the question of pig iron, may I ask him a question that may bear upon the estimates of Judge Gary? Judge Gary, in the same statement, a written statement, where he estimated the cost of the production of pig iron by his company at \$15.30, said that the cost in Germany under similar conditions is \$8.71.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman refers to the statement filed by Judge Gary some time after his examination and cross-examination by the committee, made up by one of his subordinates, to which an affidavit was attached, in which he did put the cost of Germany and Belgium and England altogether somewhere about \$9 a ton at the furnace, and he did advance in that statement the cost of his own pig, and that he figured it completely so as to manage to show that he needed almost to the penny the exact duty of \$4 a ton. That is what I recollect about that.

Mr. HOBSON. The second part of the same question, if you please. Does the gentleman understand that in the estimate of \$15.30 per ton as the cost of production that there is included not only the 30 cents per ton royalty on iron ore from their own lands, 40 cents per ton of ore for depreciation on their own lands, but also includes 40 cents depreciation of the furnaces which had been included in the total cost otherwise provided for in maintenance and up-keep; also various items termed "profits," of subsidiary companies which, in reality, go to the steel company itself, namely, \$1.06 per ton of ore profit for mining company, 55 cents per ton of ore profit in freight, and 54 cents per ton of ore profit in coke, making altogether \$5.47 per ton of iron, which should be deducted from the cost figure \$15.30, or a net cost of \$9.83?

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question before I answer? Is the gentleman for or against the reduction of the duty on pig iron?

Mr. HOBSON. I come from a section in which the manufacture of pig iron has become a great industry [laughter and applause]; and I am glad to be able to say that our conditions for this manufacture are such that when we come right down to similar bed-rock conditions in the production of pig iron all over the world, as illustrated in the years 1896, 1897, and 1898, that the people of my section were able and would now be able to put down and did put down pig iron in every pig-iron market of the world, including Pittsburgh, at a profit, where the local furnaces could not meet the competition. Now, to answer the gentleman's statement direct, I believe that the reduction should have been a little more drastic than it was, if you can use that word. I believe it should have been put down as much as a third more. This could work no injury to the pig-iron industry of this country, and would at the same time cause some importations, which were only 200,000 tons last year, though our consumption is about 25,000,000 tons. If the duty were put down somewhat lower than is proposed, it would enable the people in the coast States to get the benefit of it, and it would also yield us revenue. In view of the vital importance to the general prosperity and revival of business for the cost of structural materials to be reduced and to be kept down, I believe the reduction should have been made greater than it was, even though my own district might naturally wish a higher duty—

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the gentleman. I also want to say that he is the first southern Democrat I have come across that did not want all the products in his district or immediate vicinity—I mean that has expressed himself on the subject—that did not want a rate fully equal to the Dingley rate or a little larger.

Mr. BURLESON. You must keep away from this side of the Chamber when you say the gentleman is the first one.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course I except the gentleman from Texas, because I see he is not of that way of thinking. Now to answer the gentleman's question, which I have almost forgotten. I did not figure the profit as much as the gentleman stated, but

I did make out from the statement that there was no question about the reduction of the duty on pig iron to the extent made by the committee, nor any decent excuse or rational excuse under the heavens against reducing it given by a single man in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's statements have been predicated upon the minimum tariff in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. And the estimated revenue in this circular which I hold in my hand is also predicated on the minimum schedules?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman, under existing conditions of trade agreements between the countries, if they remain as they are now, to how many countries from which we have importations will the maximum schedule of this bill apply as regards pig iron?

Mr. PAYNE. How much?

Mr. GARRETT. To how many countries from which we have importations would the maximum schedule apply as to pig iron under present conditions?

Mr. PAYNE. I am not familiar with all the trade relations with all the countries. I have only one country in mind at this moment.

Mr. GARRETT. That is Germany?

Mr. PAYNE. I had in mind France, with her new tariff; possibly Germany. Undoubtedly the maximum rate would apply to France as at present, and I am inclined to think to Germany, but I am not quite sure about that. It requires more investigation than I have been able to give it.

Mr. GARRETT. Has the gentleman before him there the importations from France and Germany?

Mr. PAYNE. Importations of what?

Mr. GARRETT. Of pig iron.

Mr. PAYNE. No; I have not. I have not the details here.

Mr. GARRETT. I am trying to get it for the purpose of studying it from the revenue standpoint, from the maximum as well as the minimum schedule.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KENNEDY] spoke of the subject of scrap. Gentlemen appeared before the committee and stated that in the new process of making steel, the open-hearth process, it was absolutely essential that they have wrought-iron and wrought-steel scrap, and that there was not produced in the furnaces, from that clipped from the rails and all that sort of thing, enough to furnish the open hearths with a sufficient quantity of this wrought iron and steel scrap. The reason it is necessary to have it is that the pig contains so great a quantity of carbon that when it is superheated the carbon makes it boil over, the carbon is not consumed rapidly enough, and the scrap helps to steady it. There is not so much carbon in that, and they are able in that way to make the open-hearth steel with greater facility and greater ease.

In fact, one man told me that they could not make this steel unless they had scrap to put with the pig iron. An appeal was made to the committee to put scrap steel and scrap iron on the free list. They said it was already scarce in this country, that there was not sufficient to supply the demand, and with the universal revolution in steel manufacture, going from the old Bessemer furnaces to the open-hearth process, there was a famine in scrap, and that there would be a greater famine when the furnaces had all started up. He thought it was essential for the prosperity of the business to put this scrap on the free list.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. I have read the hearings. But your section 116 makes no distinction between cast-iron scrap and cast-steel scrap; and the furnaces producing iron to be exported to this country would not make any pig iron. They would make it all into scrap cast iron and send it in at 50 cents a ton.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, that may be so and it may not be. When this paragraph was considered by the committee and in all the hearings it was never suggested that there was any such thing as scrap cast iron, unless it was an old stove broken up or something of that kind.

Such a thing as making scrap iron from the manufacture of pig, or the breaking up of pig, never occurred to anybody on the committee or to anybody who appeared before the committee. We had a general idea that we knew what scrap was, that the scrap made in the manufacture of steel would be scrap steel and that it referred to wrought iron and wrought steel. I have had some talk with gentlemen since who are skilled in the business, and they are a little doubtful, but are inclined to the opinion that the name applied to wrought scrap iron and scrap steel; but we wanted it made perfectly plain, and I have no objection to an amendment that confines that to wrought iron and wrought steel, so that there will be no ques-

tion about it, and no ground for the apprehension that seems to be raised here that pig iron broken in two would be scrap iron.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. It would not be iron in pigs, at all events.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think it would help it by breaking it in two.

Mr. JAMES. What provision, if any, is made in this bill relative to the tax upon tobacco in the hand or in the unmanufactured state?

Mr. PAYNE. There is no provision at all made in regard to it. The old law remains.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman is aware, of course, that his committee unanimously reported to the House, and the House three times passed without a dissenting vote, a bill taking the tax off tobacco in the hand or in an unmanufactured state, and it failed of passage in the Senate, and I should like to know if he would object to an amendment embodying that provision in this bill? Such a law would greatly aid the tobacco growers of my State in their fight against the tobacco trust.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose the gentleman from Kentucky would vote for the bill if that was put in it?

Mr. JAMES. I do not propose to commit myself to the bill. [Laughter.] I will gladly support such an amendment as I suggest, however.

Mr. PAYNE. Then, I do not propose to commit myself now to the gentleman's proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACON. I have been waiting for some time to ask the gentleman about a paragraph in this bill, but I wanted him to get away from the pig-iron schedule before I interrupted him.

Mr. PAYNE. I will try to get away from it as soon as I can and get down to steel billets.

Mr. MACON. I want to ask the gentleman a question about paragraph 548. He has in a good-natured way made the statement several times about the bill being fashioned in favor of the laboring man and the laboring woman.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman ask his question and not make a speech?

Mr. MACON. Oh, the gentleman need not become impatient.

Mr. PAYNE. I am impatient because I do not want to trespass too long on the patience of the House.

Mr. MACON. The question is this, paragraph 548 which says:

Diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut, and not advanced in condition or value from their natural state by cleaning, splitting, cutting, or other process, including glaziers' and engravers' diamonds not set.

Now, I would like to know what laborer this is in the interest of—

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman wants to know why there is no duty on rough diamonds.

Mr. MACON. Yes; and why this is in the interest of the laboring man.

Mr. PAYNE. I know about the laboring man, and I know he is not wearing diamonds as well as does the gentleman.

Mr. MACON. I want to know how uncut diamonds on the free list can be in the interest of the laboring man and the laboring woman—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. Then I would like to be protected.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to treat the gentleman from New York fairly, and I would like to know what he means by asking the protection of the Chair as against me.

Mr. PAYNE. I will tell the gentleman, if he will stop long enough. I was trying to answer his question and he kept interrupting, and I asked the Chair to stop him.

Mr. MACON. The only question I asked the gentleman was how rough diamonds—

Mr. PAYNE. And the world is waiting breathlessly for an answer. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, on cut diamonds we put a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem. We did it advisedly. No one would like to put a higher duty on diamonds than myself, if it could be collected. When the Wilson bill was framed Mr. Wilson conferred with me about the duty on diamonds. I told him that he would find that a duty higher than 10 per cent on cut diamonds could not be collected. It would pay a man to run the risk of smuggling. Notwithstanding my sound advice which I gave to him on that and other questions, he persisted and put a duty of 25 per cent on cut diamonds. I happened

to be in Paris a year or two after his bill was in operation, and I talked with branches there of Tiffany & Black, I think, from a firm in Chicago about diamonds. They said they had not imported into the United States a diamond since a month or two after the Wilson bill went into operation, because they could buy them in this country a good deal cheaper than they could import them and pay the duty on them. The duty was so high that it paid a man to run the risk of smuggling diamonds into the country.

It has been the universal experience of gentlemen connected with the collection of revenue, almost from the foundation of the Government down to the present day, that not more than 10 per cent can be collected on diamonds. We get a much larger revenue from diamonds than they did under the Wilson bill at two and a half times the rate of duty. A handful of diamonds at 25 per cent would pay a man to go over to Europe and back and pay all his expenses, and a large salary for the time occupied. Of course, he runs a risk, but the pay is large, and plenty of people in the United States are willing to undertake it.

Now, not being able to put more than 10 per cent on diamonds cut, the question came whether we could put any duty on rough diamonds. The diamonds imported are, to some extent, rough diamonds. We have people here who cut diamonds, not a large number of them, but they make their living from it. They have built up a trade in this country of this kind, and if they can not get the material free of duty they can not make their wages and run the risk of making mistakes in cutting the diamonds.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it not true that this Government maintains in all the diamond markets of Europe an expert secret service, and if a man buys diamonds in any great quantities, that fact is reported to the customs officers here with a complete list of the diamonds and a description of the person buying them?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I put the statement of the gentleman against the experience of those engaged in that business, with the further statement that that may apply to the honest dealer. There is no question about collecting the duty of him. It does not apply, however, to all the dealers. The United States Government can not put its hand out on a man in Germany and in France and compel him under customs regulations to make an oath. It can not go into that thing. The United States Government is directly at their mercy, and the experience has demonstrated that a higher duty than 10 per cent can not be collected.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the testimony of the collector of the port of New York, with regard to the impossibility of appraising rough diamonds. I believe he testified to the effect that a man who could appraise a rough diamond would have to have at least \$10,000 a year salary, and he thought there would be such difficulty in the administration of any such provision that it ought not to go into the law.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to that, and I think he further stated that it was difficult even with an expert to properly appraise a rough diamond.

Mr. McCALL. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Although they are appraised, of course, and they have to make some sort of an appraisal of them when they sell them.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman's explanation as to the reason for carrying uncut diamonds on the free list is no doubt satisfactory to himself, but it is hardly so to me. I now want to know why it is that he proposes to put paragraph 709 on the free list. Smugglers can not bring them into the United States like they can diamonds. I read from that paragraph:

709. Works of art, drawings, engravings, photographic pictures, and philosophical and scientific apparatus brought by professional artists, lecturers, or scientists arriving from abroad, for use by them temporarily for exhibition and in illustration, promotion, and encouragement of art, science, or industry in the United States, and not for sale, shall be admitted free of duty, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the question of putting works of art on the free list has been a mooted question ever since I became a member of this committee twenty years ago. The McKinley bill put works of art on the free list, as reported to the House. That bill passed the House in that shape, and the Senate put on a duty, which was finally made at the rate of 15 per cent. When Mr. Wilson reported his bill to the House, he reported works of art free. I think it went through the House



with works of art on the free list, and a duty was afterwards put on, but I am not sure about that.

Mr. McCALL. I think not. I think the bill as it passed carried art free.

Mr. PAYNE. I am inclined to think it did, when it became a law.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt just there?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I would ask the gentleman to allow me to answer his question.

Mr. MACON. I want to say this, that I do not care anything about whether it was in the Wilson bill or not. Is it right for it to be in this bill is what I want to know?

Mr. PAYNE. O Mr. Chairman, I was only trying to show to the gentleman that it was a mooted question that had been in debate, and people took both sides of it. Mr. Chairman, having proceeded thus far, when we came to make the Dingley bill we were looking for revenue—

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Before the gentleman starts on that, will he allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, let me answer the question of the gentleman from Arkansas. The Dingley bill, looking for revenues, put works of art back onto the revenue list, and we got a revenue out of it. When the hearings were had on this bill, a number of gentlemen appeared before the committee and appealed to have works of art put on the free list. They said that it was an educational measure, that these great works of art exhibited to the people, to the young people of the United States, was of itself a liberal education in some directions, and they spoke of the connection between a study of art, the æsthetic, and a study of other subjects, leading up to practical work in everyday life, and made a very strong argument toward allowing works of art to come into this country free of duty for the purposes of education.

The committee considered some time the proposition as to whether they should not admit these works of art free of duty, provided that the owner of them would agree to put them in a public gallery, to be built by the United States and cared for by them—the question of making an art gallery of the Smithsonian building, which was denied in the House a year ago when the appropriation for finishing that building was being discussed—and it appeared to the committee that they were not warranted in inaugurating any such expense as that, which would open a free art gallery at the expense of the United States, to be maintained and kept by them, where these works of art should be deposited for a year or so after they were imported. Of course it would not end with an art gallery in Washington, but every large city, like New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago—and I am reminded of St. Louis by the smile of my genial friend from that city—and other cities would demand the same thing. It would lead to endless expense, which we are not warranted in incurring. But the committee thought we might open up the subject as far as we have in this bill and provide that works of art that had survived for twenty years and still were called works of art, both painting and statuary, should come in free.

That they had sufficient merit in them if they had survived this length of time and anybody wished to buy and import them and set them up as a standard for education in art, as a standard for the youth of America to learn from and get lessons that would be of value to them, so we exempted works of art of that age from the protective duty or any duty and left the other duty, which is not a protective but a revenue duty, where it is. I do not believe that this clause will tend to reduce the revenues of the United States, because these works of art of this age and merit are of such great value that the owner of them, even if he is wealthy, hesitates to pay the duty to bring them into the United States. That is the reason, I want to say to my friend from Arkansas, that we have made this provision in this bill.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is making a very interesting talk, and I hope the committee will have the opportunity to apply his logic to this bill, and I want to ask whether or not we will have an opportunity to offer amendments to each paragraph of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, just possess your soul in patience and let me finish this speech, if there is any end to it. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas having asked the question I proposed to propound, and the answer having been given, I withdraw. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended—

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, it is extended indefinitely now. That is

one trouble to me, as I can not refuse interruptions, because I have unlimited time.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman from New York will permit, I attended the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee for one day. Fortunately the boot and shoe men were given a hearing on that day, and I heard a representative of the boot and shoe industry say that they were willing to have free boots and shoes if they could have free hides. You have given free hides in this bill. Now, why did not the committee take them at their word and give the people the benefit of free boots and shoes?

Mr. PAYNE. I will talk about that with the committee later. I am now on the subject of steel billets, and I will not be led aside no matter how enticing may be the inducement.

Mr. BURLESON. I thought the gentleman had talked about diamonds and talked about works of art, and I thought this was an opportune time to make known to the American people the reason why they do not have boots and shoes free of duty.

Mr. PAYNE. I did that because my genial friend from Arkansas insisted I should answer the question, and I saw no other way out of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman prefers to defer his answer I will await with pleasure.

Mr. PAYNE. I will take the time later.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit this question in regard to works of art—

Mr. PAYNE. If it is about steel billets I will—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to know now why works of art 20 years old are permitted to come in free.

Mr. PAYNE. I have just been over that in the last fifteen minutes. I refer the gentleman to the RECORD, as I can say nothing more on that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Are they to be old enough to vote? I think they should have been 21 years of age.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to go on in reference to steel billets, Judge Gary gave the cost of steel billets, Bessemer, \$20.18 a ton; open hearth, \$20.87, and in that he put the cost of pig iron at \$15.06; cost of converting pig into ingots, \$2.88; cost of converting ingots to rails, \$3.22; depreciation, 84 cents, making a total of \$22 for steel rails. Mr. Pepper reports from the Dortmund district the cost of pig iron at \$14.28, and cost of conversion into ingots \$3.81, making a total of \$18.09, as against \$20.18 of Mr. Gary. The cost of Luxemburg pig iron, \$12.65, and the conversion into steel billets is \$5.95, a total of \$18.53, as against \$20.18. Mr. Smith, of the Bureau of Manufactures, reports that these companies reported to him the cost of Bessemer billets at \$20.18, and the cost of open-hearth billets at \$20.87.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have reduced the duty on steel billets by cutting it in two. We have not reduced it beyond the protection point. We still furnish protection. The measure of the difference of cost of production here and in Germany leaves here an ample protection upon the steel billets in making this reduction. We have done the same thing with steel rails. I will not delay the committee by giving the figures that have been presented by these gentlemen. I may say in regard to steel rails that I believed in 1897, and it was my own individual opinion, that it was time and proper then to cut the duty in two on steel rails, as the committee has done to-day. Some of the gentlemen are willing to admit that it might have been done at that time. At any rate, they propose to do it now. But generally, I think, the steel men are pretty well satisfied with these schedules. I know that some of them have expressed satisfaction at the result of this bill and the fairness of it and have paid the committee the compliment of saying that, while there are a few minor things where it is not exactly well balanced, on the whole it is a good bill on the iron and steel schedules. Now, I want to ask the Clerk to read a newspaper clipping of this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Washington Post, March 22, 1909.]

AWAKENING IN STEEL MILLS—PLANTS IDLE FOR MANY MONTHS WILL RESUME WORK TO-DAY—TIN PLATE AND SHEET BUSINESS SHOWS MORE ACTIVITY, WHILE PUDDLERS AND PIPE MAKERS HAVE JOBS.

(Special to the Washington Post.)

PITTSBURG, March 21, 1909.

Three tin-plate plants, two sheet plants, and a puddling plant, some of which have been idle the past seventeen months, will resume work to-morrow morning, giving employment to more than 5,000 skilled men. The Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company will begin work on the order for electric motors for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the steel-pipe industry has taken on a boom. By April 1 additional plants will be in operation.

The Greer tin-plate plant, at Newcastle, Pa., of 20 mills, will resume to-morrow, after an idleness of nine months. This is one of the largest in the world. The La Belle plant of 10 mills, at Wheeling,

W. Va., will also resume, after a year's idleness. The New Kensington (Pa.) plant of 8 mills, and the Demmler, at McKeesport, of 11 mills, will also resume. These are all operated by the American Sheet and Tin Plate Company. In addition, 2 sheet mills, Leechburg and Scottsdale, will get under way, after having been idle since the fall of 1907. The American Sheet and Tin Plate Company will, by April 1, have 213 tin mills in operation, as against 164 last week.

After seventeen months' idleness, the puddling furnaces of the Crucible Steel Company of America, of this city, will be started to-morrow morning. As nothing but refined iron is produced in this plant, the men are paid a higher price for puddling than the regular scale of wages. The finishing mills of the Crucible Company will increase operations.

Orders aggregating \$8,000,000 for steel pipe are soon to be let. Orders and inquiries aggregating 400 miles of pipe have been placed by gas and oil companies, and this will probably increase 400 miles more in another month.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desired to have that extract from the paper of this morning read for the benefit of any timid soul in the House who fears that the committee by the reductions they have made upon the metal schedules have possibly done any injustice to any manufacturing business in the United States. It is a well-known fact that there has been a cut and a reduction in the prices of these articles, led on, perhaps, by the United States Steel Company, perhaps occasioned, however, by a cut made by some minor companies—in many instances a cut greater than the reduction in duty made by this bill. And still there is no reduction in the wages of the men. Still, according to the dispatch, which has just been made after the publication of the schedules of this bill, thousands of men are called back into the shops that have been vacant and idle for nine months, and given work at American wages, responding to the call of these companies who have made these reductions, to increase their business or get new business, and in response to this bill introduced in the House of Representatives and now under discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to stop now and go on after an adjournment of the House to-morrow.

I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a question in regard to the free-hide proposition?

Mr. PAYNE. I will talk about that in the morning.

Mr. WEISSE. I wish to state, also, that since this free-hide schedule has been inserted in the bill hides have been advanced 10 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Wait until to-morrow and ask me the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following House concurrent resolution:

#### House concurrent resolution 5.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the two Houses 30,000 copies of the bill of the House (H. R. 1438) entitled "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," with an index thereto, and the same number of the report thereon, 25,000 copies of said report to be accompanied with the views of the minority, all in document form, 9,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 21,000 copies for the use of the House.*

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. PEARRE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Charles E. Welker, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MUDD, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. STURGISS, for two days, on account of important business.

#### VIEWS OF MINORITY ON TARIFF BILL.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to file the minority views on the tariff bill. We have until to-morrow, but I think we will file them now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the views of the minority may be printed in the RECORD, so that we can get them in the morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the views of the minority upon this bill, the tariff bill, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether it may not be advisable to print both the report as well as the views of the minority together in the RECORD, so that they will be side by side?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I hope that will be done.

Mr. PAYNE. The report of the committee has not been printed in the RECORD. They might go in together.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. And I ask that both the report of the committee and the views of the minority be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the tariff bill, with the views of the minority, be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

#### [House Report No. 1. Sixty-first Congress, first session.]

TO PROVIDE REVENUE, EQUALIZE DUTIES, ENCOURAGE THE INDUSTRIES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 1438:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1438) entitled "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The main reasons for the revision of the tariff at this time are two: First, that after twelve years of the operation of the present tariff many new conditions have arisen which render it advisable that the rates be readjusted. This has been confirmed by the information received by the committee, and a large number of rates have been readjusted in the bill proposed. Second, since the passage of the Dingley Act a large number of foreign countries have adopted tariffs with a maximum and minimum rate, and it has been found that section 3 of the present act was not sufficiently broad in its scope to meet these changed conditions.

It is true that the State Department, through a number of commercial agreements with different countries, has obtained more favorable rates. But to obtain such concessions in exchange for the meager inducements proposed in section 3 has grown more difficult from year to year, until now we are compelled to face the maximum rates in one or more countries on a large portion of our exports. It is imperative that these latter conditions should be fully met, and the bill amply provides for reciprocal tariff arrangements.

The present tariff in interchange for favorable trade arrangements affords no inducement except a lower rate of duty on argols, wines, and works of art. The bill reported proposes a reduced rate on the bulk of our imported articles.

In the formation of the bill, the committee has had no easy task. There has been a popular demand, more or less widespread, for a general cutting of rates. It has been the cardinal principle of the party in power that the tariff should be protective to American industries and to American workmen. This principle was incorporated in the national platform, and the election carried with it an endorsement of that platform. On the other hand, while duties should be protective, they should be adjusted as nearly as possible to represent the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

Another question before the committee has been that of revenue. Under the present law the revenues for the whole period of its existence have been abundant, and the surplus of receipts over expenditures up to the 16th day of this month have exceeded the disbursements by \$74,555,408, to wit:

July 1, 1897, to March 16, 1909, inclusive.

Total receipts (except postal)	\$6,558,220,264
Total expenditures (except postal)	6,483,664,856
Surplus	74,555,408

To this amount should be added the amount of the purchase price paid for the Panama Canal and nearly \$10,000,000 in addition, in all \$50,000,000, which has been paid out of the receipts during the period mentioned, and which will be reimbursed by a sale of bonds, making the total surplus for the twelve years \$124,555,408. But owing to the depression in business the revenues have been greatly impaired since the fall of 1907, while the expenditures have increased in proportion to the population and the magnitude of the undertakings of the Government. It is the hope of the committee that with a return of business prosperity the revenues will show a large percentage of increase and prove entirely adequate for any rational and economical scale of expenditures.

However, during the same period there was a large deficit in the postal revenues, to wit:

July 1, 1897, to September 30, 1908.

Postal receipts	\$1,539,700,032
Postal expenditures	1,638,843,511
Deficit	99,143,479

The total receipts of the Government, including postal, are as follows:

July 1, 1897, to March 16, 1909.

Total receipts	\$8,097,920,296
Advanced payment on Panama Canal	50,000,000
Total expenditures, including postal	\$8,147,920,296
Surplus	8,122,608,367
	25,411,929



Since the first of the present month the revenues have shown a gratifying increase, and the deficit for the first sixteen days of the month is only \$1,814,799.30. This is at the rate of about \$3,500,000 per month, instead of \$10,000,000 deficit on an average since July 1.

The committee has analyzed carefully the appropriations for the fiscal year 1910 to ascertain the amount of money required to meet them.

It is their belief that the entire expenditure for the building of the Panama Canal should be met by bonds issued for that purpose, and they have authorized in the bill a provision for the issue of bonds equal to the original appropriation of \$40,000,000 for the purchase of the canal, which was paid out of the general fund in the Treasury.

It is proved by experience and from an examination of the appropriations from year to year that a balance of from 6 to 8 per cent of the appropriations calling for the payment of money is unexpended at the end of each fiscal year. In estimating for the expenditure of money for the year 1910 the committee has made a deduction of only 5 per cent on this account in order to furnish a conservative estimate.

The estimates of the revenue to be derived from customs made by the committee, and found below, are on the basis of the importations for the fiscal year 1906. That year was selected because it was the last year of normal conditions. If the year 1907 had been taken as a basis, at least \$30,000,000 would be added to this estimate, and it is quite probable that the importations under this bill during the second year of its existence will equal or exceed those of 1907, and that the revenue will approach the same amount.

With these explanations the committee submits the following table showing the estimate of the amount of money required to meet the expenditures under the appropriations for 1910, and the estimate for revenue, viz:

Total appropriations for 1910.....	\$1,044,014,298.23
Deduct estimated sinking-fund appropriation.....	\$60,000,000.00
Deduct bank-note redemption (paid by banks).....	30,000,000.00
Deduct Panama Canal appropriation, to be provided by bonds.....	35,886,190.58
	125,886,190.58
Deduct 5 per cent estimated appropriations which are not usually expended.....	918,128,107.65
	45,906,405.88
Amount for which revenue is to be provided.....	872,221,701.77
Estimated revenues, Report, Secretary Treasury:	
From internal revenue.....	\$250,000,000
From miscellaneous revenue.....	62,000,000
From postal revenue.....	223,340,712
Estimated by committee from—	
Customs under proposed bill.....	305,225,173
Internal revenue on legacies, etc.....	20,000,000
Internal revenue on cigarettes, increase.....	1,500,000
	862,065,885.00
Deficit.....	10,155,816.77

This estimate shows a deficit of about \$10,000,000. If the bill could have its full effect during the year 1910, this deficit would be more than wiped out by the increased revenue.

With return of prosperity, which the committee believe will follow a settlement of the tariff question, and with a continuation of the increase in revenue which has manifested itself during the present month, there is no doubt but that this bill will produce a largely increased revenue to that estimated above.

The committee therefore are abundantly justified in the belief that the bill will produce sufficient revenue after the year 1910, even if it does not during that fiscal year. Of course the latter is dependent upon the question of revival of business and trade.

The Treasury, however, is amply protected by the authorized issue of \$40,000,000 of the canal purchase bonds and the additional issue which can be made at any time to upward of forty millions in addition for excess of expenditures beyond the proceeds of the sale of bonds already made, and the appropriations for the year 1910.

The committee has, from time to time during the past two years, been obtaining information for a revision of the tariff, to have it in readiness whenever such revision should be undertaken. During the past year, and especially since the resolution of May 16 last, the committee has had an additional force of clerks at work, mainly of experts in tariff matters, detailed from the different departments by the order of the President, obtaining and properly tabulating the information that came to the committee. They also prepared blanks early in the summer, which were sent to all of our consuls and consular agents seeking detailed information as to the cost of labor, manufacture, etc., in the foreign countries. There has been a large number of responses to these inquiries, which have been properly filed and have been available for the use of the committee. This information has been particularly useful for comparison with the statements of wages paid abroad submitted in the public hearings before the committee, in some cases confirming the statements and in others contradicting the statements made before the committee.

The committee has also obtained valuable information through the Department of Commerce and Labor from special agents employed in that department who have reported from time to time on the industries abroad, frequently furnishing very detailed and valuable information.

The committee opened up hearings at Washington on the 10th day of November, which continued daily until the 24th day of December, and everyone who desired an oral hearing up to that time was granted the privilege. Since then briefs have been invited and have been filed. This information has been printed for the use of the committee, and a carefully indexed edition will be distributed to the Members of the House, covering more than 8,000 printed pages, and a large portion of it replete with information bearing directly upon the questions involved.

The subcommittee preparing the bill has been in daily sessions since the 24th of December. Each paragraph in the former tariff has been very carefully considered, and the hearings bearing upon the same have been carefully examined and read by the committee.

The minimum rates are embraced in sections 1 and 2, section 2 being the free list. These sections present rates under which it is expected the great bulk of importations will come into the United States.

Section 3 presents the maximum rates of duty, in which the rates are generally 20 per cent of the rates imposed in section 1 in addition to

the rates imposed under said section 1, and a rate of 20 per cent on a large portion of the principal items contained in section 2 or the free list.

Section 4 provides for the time and method of application of the minimum and maximum rates to different countries and is automatic in effect. Any nation which gives the United States equally favorable trade relations with those given to any other nation is entitled to the minimum rate; if they discriminate against imports from the United States, they must pay the maximum rates. Of course, this matter of discrimination will be determined in the first instance by the Secretary of the Treasury in order that he may enforce its provisions. Ultimately, the courts must finally decide the question.

It has been complained that section 3 of the present law was unjust in discrimination, so far as Great Britain was concerned. There seemed to be no way by which they could get the minimum rates under section 3, while they have treated our national trade relations with fairness and impartiality. Under a continuance of their present policy they are entitled, at once, to the minimum rates under this bill.

The committee has caused a most thorough examination to be made of the classification under the various paragraphs of the present law. A most thorough analysis has been made of all the decisions of the courts and of the general appraisers for the past fifteen years, and amendments suggested conforming the language of the various paragraphs to meet the decisions of the courts and render the language of the act clear, so that the courts will have no difficulty in interpreting the meaning of Congress. It is believed that the amendments that the committee has proposed in these particulars will greatly facilitate the proper enforcement of the law and render it more certain than any previous tariff act.

The committee has prepared and printed "Notes on the Tariff," which embraces a digest of all these decisions and furnishes concise and accurate information as to the various articles enumerated in the tariff law, with a statement of the importations in 1907, and the production and domestic consumption of each in 1905. This publication and the comparison of import duties for each fiscal year since 1894, also prepared for the use of the committee, have been of great service in the preparation of the bill, as they will be to the Members of the House in its consideration.

The following is a statement, in general, of the changes in the rates made in section 1, and also the general provisions of the bill, viz:

#### INCREASED DUTIES.

The committee have transferred some articles from the free list to the dutiable, and have increased duties on others for the sole purpose of increasing the revenue. Most of these articles on which duties have been increased are luxuries. Of this class the rates of duty have been increased as follows:

#### SCHEDULE A.

Perfumeries and toilet articles, from 50 to 60 per cent ad valorem.  
Fancy soap, from 15 to 20 cents per pound.

#### SCHEDULE C.

Swords and side arms, from 35 to 50 per cent ad valorem.  
Bottle caps, if enameled, etc., from 45 to 55 per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE G.

Chicory root, raw, not dried, from 1 cent to 2½ cents per pound; roasted, etc., from 2½ cents to 5 cents per pound.

Cocoa, crude, from the free list to the dutiable, at 4 cents per pound; prepared or manufactured, valued at not over 15 cents per pound, from 2½ cents to 5½ cents; valued above 15 cents and not above 24 cents, from 2½ cents to 5½ cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued above 24 cents and not above 35 cents, from 5 to 7 cents per pound, and the same ad valorem; valued above 35 cents, remains the same; powdered cocoa, from 5 cents to 9 cents per pound.  
Cocoa butter, from 3½ cents to 5½ cents per pound.

Dandelion root, and articles used as a substitute for coffee, 2½ cents to 4 cents per pound.

Spices: Mustard, unground and not prepared in any manner, from free list to 30 per cent ad valorem; if ground or prepared, 10 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; red pepper, cayenne pepper, cassia, cassia vera and cassia buds, cinnamon and chips of cloves and clove stems, mace, nutmegs, pepper, black or white, pimento, and spices not specially provided for, when unground, 30 per cent ad valorem; if ground, 2½ cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; ginger root, unground and not preserved or candied, 30 per cent ad valorem; if ground or otherwise prepared, 2½ cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem. The crude or natural of the foregoing spices are transferred from the free list, and if advanced in any manner an additional duty of 30 per cent ad valorem is added.

#### SCHEDULE N.

Feathers, from 15 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem; feathers, dressed, colored, etc., from 50 per cent to 60 per cent.

Furs, dressed on the skin, from 20 per cent to 27½ per cent ad valorem.  
Manufactures of hair, from 20 to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Duties on the following articles have been increased because the committee found that there was not sufficient protection under the present law:

#### SCHEDULE A.

Oxalic acid has been transferred from the free list with a duty of 1 cent per pound.

Coal-tar dyes or colors, now bearing a duty of 30 per cent, to 35 per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE B.

Keene's cement or other cement in which gypsum is the component material of chief value, from 30 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Asphaltum and bitumen, not refined or otherwise advanced in condition from its natural state, to fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound on the bitumen contained therein.

Fluorspar, crude, from 10 per cent ad valorem to 50 cents per ton; crushed or otherwise manufactured, from 20 per cent ad valorem to \$1.75 per ton.

Cast polished plate glass, increased from 8 cents to 10 cents per square foot on sizes not exceeding 16 by 24 square inches, and on those above that and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches, from 10 cents to 12½ cents per square foot; all above that, 22½ cents per square foot, which is a reduction on nearly all of these larger sizes.

#### SCHEDULE C.

Pins with solid heads, the same rate of duty, 35 per cent ad valorem; with ornamental heads, with a new classification, including those set

with precious stones, pearls, or corals, from 40 to 50 per cent ad valorem.

Watch movements, with more than 7 jewels, from 35 cents each and 25 per cent ad valorem to 70 cents each; if more than 7 jewels and not more than 11, from 50 cents each and 25 per cent ad valorem to \$1.35 each; more than 11 and not more than 15 jewels, from 75 cents each and 25 per cent ad valorem to \$1.85 each; having more than 17 jewels, the rates of duty remain the same.

Watch cases and parts of watches and clocks, the duty remains the same.

Zinc in ore, now brought in at 20 per cent ad valorem, to 1 cent per pound for the zinc contents contained therein.

#### SCHEDULE D.

Osier or willow, prepared for basket makers' use, from 20 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Porch and window blinds, not stained, dyed, painted, etc., remain at 35 per cent ad valorem; if stained, dyed, etc., an increase from 35 per cent to 40 per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE G.

Peas, split peas, from 40 cents to 45 cents per bushel.

Figs, from 2 cents to 2½ cents per pound.

Lemons, from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound.

Pineapples, from \$7 per thousand to \$8 per thousand.

#### SCHEDULE I.

An additional duty of 1 cent per yard on mercerized fabrics (a new process of manufacture invented since the present law was enacted).

Also a small additional duty on lappets. There is also an increased duty on stockings fashioned and shaped wholly or in part on knitting machines.

#### SCHEDULE M.

Surface-coated papers, wholly or partially covered with metal, from 3 cents and 20 per cent to 5 cents and 20 per cent ad valorem; other surface-coated paper, from 2½ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem to 5 cents per pound.

Lithographic prints, from 6 cents per pound to 8 cents; cardboard, from 20 cents to 25 cents per pound; other paper, 20 cents to 25 cents per pound, with small increases on various sizes of other paper. Lithographic cigar labels, etc., from 20 cents per pound to 30 cents per pound; printed in colors less than eight, from 20 cents to 30 cents per pound; more than eight, from 30 cents to 37½ cents per pound; printed in metal leaf, from 50 cents per pound to 52½ cents per pound; paper hangings, from 25 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem; paper not specially provided for, from 25 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Plain paper envelopes, from 20 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE N.

Women's and children's gloves, not over 14 inches in length, as follows:

"Schmaschen" from \$1.75 per dozen pair.

"Glacé" of sheep origin from \$2.50 per dozen pair.

"Glacé" other than sheep origin from \$3 per dozen pair.

"With exterior grain surface removed" from \$2.50 per dozen pair.

"Kid of other leather than of sheepskin" from \$3 per dozen pair.

All to \$4 per dozen pair, and 35 cents in addition per dozen pair for each inch over 14.

#### REDUCTIONS IN DUTY.

#### SCHEDULE A.

Boric acid, from 5 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Chromic acid and lactic acid, from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Salicylic acid, from 10 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Tannic acid or tannin, from 50 cents to 35 cents per pound.

Gallic acid, from 10 cents to 8 cents per pound.

Tartaric acid, from 7 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Alumina, hydrate of, or refined bauxite, from six-tenths of 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Alum, alum cake, etc., from one-half of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Sulphate of ammonia now dutiable at three-tenths cent per pound is transferred to the free list.

Argols and wine lees are reduced from 5 cents per pound to 5 per cent ad valorem; tartrate of soda or potassa or Rochelle salts from 4 cents per pound to 3 cents per pound; cream of tartar and patent tartar from 6 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Borax is reduced from 5 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Borate of lime and other borate material is reduced from 4 cents to 1½ cents per pound and from 3 cents to 1 cent per pound according to the percentage of anhydrous boric acid contained.

Chloroform is reduced from 20 cents to 10 cents per pound.

Collodion and all compounds of pyroxilin are reduced from 50 to 40 cents per pound; if in sheets, etc., from 60 to 45 cents per pound; and if manufactured into articles, from 65 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem to 50 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Copperas, now dutiable at one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, is transferred to the free list.

Sulphuric ethers are reduced from 40 to 8 cents per pound.

Spirits of nitrous ether, from 25 to 20 cents per pound.

Fruit ethers, oils or essences, from \$2 to \$1 per pound; all other ethers from \$1 to 50 cents per pound.

Gelatin, glue, isinglass, valued at not above 10 cents per pound, reduced to 20 per cent ad valorem; if in sheets or articles, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Iodoform from \$1 to 75 cents per pound.

Licorice, all forms of, from 4½ cents per pound to free list.

Cotton-seed oil and croton oil transferred to the free list.

Flaxseed, linseed, and poppy-seed oil reduced from 20 to 15 cents per gallon.

Peppermint oil, reduced from 50 cents to 25 cents per pound.

Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, and umber and umber earths, if ground in oil or water, reduced from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Orange mineral, from 3½ to 2½ cents per pound.

Red lead, from 2½ cents to 2½ cents per pound.

Varnishes, reduced from 35 to 25 per cent ad valorem; and spirit varnishes from \$1.32 per gallon and 35 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Vermillion red, made of lead or containing lead and not containing quicksilver, from 5 cents to 4½ cents per pound.

White lead, white paint and pigment containing lead, from 2½ cents to 2½ cents per pound.

Whiting and Paris white, dry, from one-fourth of 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound; ground in oil, or putty, from 1 cent to one-half cent per pound.

Lead: Acetate of, white, from 3½ cents to 2½ cents per pound; brown, gray, or yellow, from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound; nitrate of, from 2½ cents to 2½ cents per pound; litharge, from 2½ cents to 2½ cents per pound.

Potash: Bichromate and chromate of, from 3 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Potash: Chlorate of, from 2½ cents to 2 cents per pound.

Plasters, healing, etc., from 35 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Santonin, from \$1 to 50 cents per pound.

Crystal carbonate of soda, from three-tenths of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; chlorate of soda, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Hydrate of, or caustic soda, from three-fourths of 1 cent to one-half cent per pound; nitrite of soda, from 2½ cents to 2 cents per pound; hyposulphite of soda, from one-half of 1 cent per pound to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Sal soda, or soda crystals, not concentrated, from two-tenths of 1 cent to one-sixth of 1 cent per pound.

Soda ash, from three-eighths of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; arseniate of soda, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Silicate of soda, or other alkaline silicate, from one-half of 1 cent to three-eighths of 1 cent per pound.

Sulphate of soda, or salt cake, or niter cake, from \$1.25 per ton to \$1.

Sponges, and manufactures of, from 40 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Strychnia, or strichnine, from 30 cents to 15 cents per ounce.

Sulphur, refined or sublimed, or flowers of, from \$8 per ton to \$6 per ton.

Vanillin, from 80 cents per ounce to 15 cents per ounce.

#### SCHEDULE B.

Fire brick, glazed, enameled, etc., reduced from 45 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem; brick other than fire brick, if glazed, enameled, etc., reduced from 45 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, from 50 cents to 40 cents per ton; if ground or calcined, from \$2.25 to \$1.75 per ton.

Filter tubes, from 45 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, above 24 by 36 inches square, reduced one-eighth of a cent per pound on all sizes; cylinder and crown glass, above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches square, reduced from 15 cents to 12 cents per square foot; sizes above that, from 20 cents to 15 cents per square foot.

Onyx in block, from \$1.50 per cubic foot to \$1 per cubic foot.

Marble, sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness, from \$1.10 to \$1 per cubic foot; slabs or paving tiles of the same containing not less than 4 superficial inches, and not more than 1 inch in thickness, from 12 cents to 10 cents per superficial foot; if more than 1 inch and not more than 1½ inches in thickness, from 15 cents to 12½ cents per superficial foot; if more than 1½ inches and not more than 2 inches in thickness, from 18 cents to 15 cents per superficial foot; if rubbed in whole or in part, from 3 cents per superficial foot, in addition, to 2 cents.

Cast polished plate glass, silvered, etc., exceeding 24 by 30 inches, 25 cents per square foot, which is a reduction on most sizes from 38 to 25 cents per square foot.

Mosaic cubes of marble, onyx, or stone, not exceeding 2 cubic inches in size: if loose, from 1 cent per pound to one-half cent and same ad valorem; if attached to paper or other material, from 20 cents to 10 cents and same ad valorem.

Freestone and other building or monumental stone, except marble and onyx, unmanufactured, from 12 cents to 6 cents per cubic foot.

Mica, cut or trimmed, from 12 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, from 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem, and mica cut or trimmed, from 12 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; all to 30 per cent ad valorem; mica plates or built up mica, 35 per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE C.

Iron ore and basic slag, from 40 cents per ton, transferred to the free list.

Pig iron, iron kentledge, and spiegeleisen, from \$4 per ton to \$2.50.

Scrap iron and steel, from \$4 per ton to 50 cents per ton.

Bar iron, from six-tenths of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound. Round iron, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, from eight-tenths of 1 cent to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than bars, from five-tenths of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Charcoal iron, from \$12 to \$6 per ton.

Beams, girders, joists, angles, etc., from five-tenths of 1 cent to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Anchors, from 1½ cents per pound to 1 cent.

Iron and steel forgings, from 35 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge, from five-tenths of 1 cent to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20, from six-tenths of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 20, from eight-tenths to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Steel bands or strips, untempered, suitable for making band saws, from 3 cents per pound to 1½ cents; if tempered, from 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem to 3 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Cotton ties, from five-tenths of 1 cent per pound to three-tenths.

Railway bars and steel rails, from seven-twentieths of 1 cent per pound to seven-fortieths; railway fish plates, from four-tenths of 1 cent per pound to two-tenths.

Iron steel sheets, valued at 3 cents per pound or less, thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, from seven-tenths to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than 20 and not thinner than 25, from eight-tenths to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than 25 and not thinner than 32, from 1.1 to eight-tenths cent per pound; thinner than 32, from 1.2 to nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound; corrugated or crimped, from 1.1 to eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Sheets, polished, planished, or glanced, from 2 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound; if pickled or cleaned, two-tenths of 1 cent per pound in addition.

Tin plates, from 1½ cents to 1.2 cents per pound.

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, etc., valued at 1 cent per pound or less, from three-tenths of 1 cent per pound to seven-fortieths; valued above 1 cent and not above 1.4 cents, from four-tenths to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.4 cents and not above 1.8 cents, from six-tenths to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.8 cents and not above 2.2 cents, from seven-tenths to



six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 2.2 cents and not above 3 cents, from nine-tenths to eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 3 cents and not above 4 cents, from 1.2 cents to 1.1 cents per pound; valued above 4 cents and not above 7 cents, from 1.3 cents to 1.2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 10 cents per pound, the same duty; valued above 10 cents and not above 13 cents per pound, from 2.4 cents to 2.3 cents per pound; valued above 13 cents and not above 16 cents per pound, from 2.8 cents to 2.7 cents per pound; valued above 16 cents per pound and not above 30 cents, from 4.7 cents to 4.6 cents per pound; valued above 30 cents per pound, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Round iron or steel wire, not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge, from 1½ cents per pound to 1 cent; smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16, from 1½ cents to 1½ cents per pound; smaller than No. 16, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound. That all the foregoing valued at more than 4 cents per pound shall pay not less than 40 per cent ad valorem.

Steel bars or rods, cold rolled, cold drawn, or cold hammered, or polished, from one-fourth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the above rates, to one-eighth of 1 cent per pound; on strips, plates, or sheets of iron or steel, other than polished, where cold rolled, etc., from 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates on plates, to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, from 1½ cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Cast-iron pipe, from four-tenths of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Cast hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Chains not less than three-fourths of an inch in diameter, from 1½ cents to seven-eighths of a cent per pound; less than three-fourths of an inch and not less than three-eighths of an inch in diameter, from 1½ cents to 1½ cents per pound; less than three-eighths and not less than five-sixteenths, from 1½ to 1½ of 1 cent per pound; less than five-sixteenths remain at 3 cents per pound. But no chains will pay less than 45 per cent ad valorem.

Lap welded, butt welded, seamed, or jointed iron or steel boiler tubes, etc., if not less than three-eighths of an inch in diameter, from 2 cents to 1 cent per pound; if less than three-eighths and not less than one-fourth, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound; if less than one-fourth, 2 cents per pound; welded cylindrical furnaces, from 2½ cents per pound to 2 cents per pound; all other iron or steel tubes, from 35 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Table, butchering, carving, etc., knives, with pearl, shell, or ivory handles, from 16 cents each to 14 cents each; handles of deer horn, from 12 cents each to 10 cents each; with handles of hard rubber, bone, celluloid, etc., from 5 cents each to 4 cents each; with other handles from 1½ cents each to 1 cent each, with the same ad valorem addition of 15 per cent. *Provided*, That none of the above shall pay at a less rate than 40 per cent ad valorem. Instead of 45 in the present law. Files were reduced from specific rates, the equivalent of 80 per cent ad valorem, to 40 per cent ad valorem.

Cut nails, spikes, from six-tenths of 1 cent to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Horseshoe nails and hob nails, from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound. Wire nails, not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, from one-half of 1 cent to one-fourth of a cent per pound; lighter than No. 16, from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Spikes, nuts, washers, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Cut tacks, not exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand, from 1½ cents to five-eighths of 1 cent per thousand; exceeding 16 ounces, from 1½ cents to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Steel plates engraved, etc., from 25 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem.

Rivets, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Crosscut saws, from 6 cents to 5 cents per foot; mill saws, from 10 cents per linear foot to 8 cents per linear foot; pit and drag saws, from 8 cents per linear foot to 6 cents per linear foot; circular saws, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem; steel band saws, from 10 cents per pound to 5 cents per pound, and 20 per cent ad valorem remaining; all other saws, reduced from 30 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Screws, more than 2 inches in length, from 4 cents to 2½ cents per pound; over 1 inch and not more than 2 inches, from 6 cents to 4 cents per pound; over one-half inch and not over 1 inch, from 8½ cents to 6 cents per pound; one-half inch and less, from 12 cents to 8 cents per pound.

Umbrella parasol ribs and stretchers, from 50 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, from 1½ cents to 1½ cents per pound; ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Aluminum, in crude form, from 8 cents to 7 cents per pound; in plates, etc., from 13 cents to 11 cents per pound.

Hooks and eyes, from 5½ cents to 4 cents per pound, retaining the additional 15 per cent ad valorem.

Lead dross, bullion, base bullion, and lead in pigs, from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound; in sheets, pipes, shot, etc., from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Monazite sand and thorite, from 6 cents to 4 cents per pound.

Zinc in blocks or pigs, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound; in sheets, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Cash registers, electrical apparatus and machinery, jute manufacturing machinery, linotype and all typesetting machines, machine tools, printing presses, sewing machines, typewriters, and all steam engines, from 45 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem. Embroidery machines and lace-making machines, the same rate, with a proviso that they may be imported free until July 1, 1911.

#### SCHEDULE D.

Timber, from 1 cent per cubic foot to one-half cent per cubic foot.

Sawed boards, planks, etc., of whitewood, sycamore, and basswood, from \$1 per thousand to 50 cents per thousand.

All other sawed lumber from \$2 to \$1. If further advanced and manufactured, the same reduction from the present law.

Paving posts, railroad ties, telephone poles, etc., from 20 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem.

Clapboards, from \$1.50 per thousand to \$1 per thousand.

Kindling wood transferred to the free list.

Laths, from 25 cents per 1,000 pieces to 20 cents per 1,000 pieces.

Fence posts, from 10 per cent to the free list.

#### SCHEDULE E.

Sugar, refined, from 1 cent and ninety-five one-hundredths of 1 cent to 1 cent and ninety-one one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound.

#### SCHEDULE G.

Barley, from 30 cents per bushel to 15 cents.

Barley malt, from 45 cents to 25 cents.

Cabbages, from 3 to 2 cents each.

Bacon and hams, from 5 cents per pound to 4 cents.

Fresh meat, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Lard, from 2 cents to 1½ cents.

Tallow, from three-fourths of 1 cent per pound to the free list.

Wool grease, from one-half of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent.

Dextrin, burnt starch, etc., from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Peas, green, from 40 cents per bushel to 30 cents per bushel.

All starch, except potato starch, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

#### SCHEDULE J.

Flax straw, at \$5 per ton under present law, and flax, not hackled or dressed, at 1 cent per pound, transferred to the free list.

Cables and cordage, reduced from 1 cent to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Threads, not finer than 5 lea or number, reduced from 13 cents to 10 cents per pound, with five-eighths instead of three-fourths of 1 cent per pound advance with each lea in number in excess of 5.

Single yarns, not finer than 8 lea, reduced from 7 cents to 6 cents per pound.

Flax gill nettings, from 25 to 20 per cent.

Carpets, mats, etc., from 5 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem to 4 cents per square yard and 30 per cent ad valorem, when valued not above 15 cents per square yard; if valued above 15 cents, from 10 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem to 8 cents per square yard and 30 per cent ad valorem.

Hydraulic hose, from 20 cents per pound to 15 cents per pound.

Oilcloth, including linoleum under 9 feet in width, the same; above 9 feet, from 20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem to 12 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem.

Waterproof cloth remains the same.

Shirts, collars, and cuffs of cotton, from 45 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem to 35 cents per dozen and 10 per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE K.

Wool of the third class, known as "carpet wool," from a duty of 4 cents per pound on such wool worth 12 cents or less, and a duty of 7 cents per pound upon such wool exceeding 12 cents in value, to a duty of 3 cents per pound on such wool valued at not more than 10 cents per pound; and if valued at more than 10 cents per pound and not more than 16 cents per pound, 3 cents per pound and in addition thereto one-half of 1 cent per pound for each cent per pound of additional value exceeding 10 cents; if valued at more than 16 cents, 7 cents per pound.

Top waste and roving waste, from 30 cents to 25 cents per pound; slubbing waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste, from 30 cents per pound to 20 cents per pound.

Shoddy, from 25 to 20 cents per pound; noils and all other wastes, from 20 to 18 cents per pound.

Woolen rags, mungo, and flocks, from 10 cents per pound to 6 cents per pound.

Tops, from 33 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem, when valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, and 44 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem when valued above 40 cents and not above 70 cents to the duty imposed on scoured wool and 6 cents in addition.

#### SCHEDULE M.

Mechanically ground wood pulp, from one-twelfth of 1 cent per pound to exemption from duty on pulp from any country not imposing export duty, etc., on certain forest products.

Printing paper, valued at not above 2½ cents per pound, from three-tenths to one-tenth of 1 cent per pound; valued above 2½ cents a pound and not above 2½ cents a pound, from four-tenths to two-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

#### SCHEDULE N.

Bituminous coal and coke, from any country admitting American coal free, from 67 cents per ton for coal and 20 per cent ad valorem for coke, to free list.

Gunpowder, valued at 20 cents and less per pound, from 4 cents per pound to 2 cents; valued over 20 cents per pound, from 6 cents per pound to 4 cents.

Cartridges, from 35 to 30 per cent ad valorem; blasting caps, from \$2.36 per thousand, equivalent to 84 per cent ad valorem, to 30 per cent ad valorem; mine and blasting powder fuse, from 35 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Hides of cattle, from 15 per cent ad valorem to free list. Band and sole leather, from 20 per cent ad valorem to 5 per cent ad valorem. Upper leather, calf skins, chamois skins, kangaroo, sheep and goat skins, and other leather not provided for, from 20 per cent to 15 per cent ad valorem. Patent leather, weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins, from 30 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 10 pounds and not over 25 pounds per dozen, from 30 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 25 pounds, from 20 cents per dozen and 20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem, all to 20 per cent ad valorem; pianoforte leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem; boots and shoes, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem; shoe laces, from 50 cents per gross and 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem; leather cut into shoe uppers, etc., from 35 to 30 per cent ad valorem; all other manufactures of leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Agricultural implements, plows, etc., from 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem, and further provision to free list from any country admitting American agricultural machinery free.

Works of art, including paintings and statuary, more than 20 years old, from 20 per cent to the free list.

The articles mentioned in the remaining paragraphs are rated substantially at the same duty as under the present law.

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

##### METHOD OF VALUATION.

The bill adds a new paragraph to section 11 of the customs administrative act, which provides for the appraisement of goods imported by consignment and not by sale where there is no market price at the place

of the origin of the goods. After reenacting the present provisions to ascertain the value the bill adds this paragraph:

"The actual market value or wholesale price, as defined by law, of any imported merchandise which is consigned for sale in the United States or which is not actually sold and freely offered for sale in usual wholesale quantities in the open market of the country of exportation to all purchasers, shall not in any case be appraised at less than the wholesale price at which such or similar imported merchandise is actually sold and freely offered for sale in usual wholesale quantities in the United States in the open market to all purchasers, due allowance by deduction being made for estimated duties thereon, cost of transportation, insurance, and other necessary expenses from the place of shipment to the place of delivery, and a reasonable commission not exceeding 10 per cent, if any of the same has been paid."

It will be seen that this provision is only applied to consigned goods, and not to those actually sold for importation.

#### PHILIPPINE IMPORTATIONS.

The bill provides for reciprocal free trade with the Philippine Islands on all articles, but limiting the sugar to be imported free of duty to 300,000 tons; wrapper tobacco to 300,000 pounds, and 3,000,000 pounds of filler tobacco, and 150,000,000 cigars in any one fiscal year. The excess of sugar, tobacco, and cigars to pay full tariff rates. This exemption from duty is confined to the growth or products of the islands, however, and does not admit articles imported into the Philippine Islands from a foreign country without payment of full rates of duty on such importations.

#### PATENTS.

A section is added applying the same rules to patents obtained in the United States by aliens that are in force in the country of which these aliens are citizens in respect to patents issued there to citizens of the United States. This will either compel foreigners obtaining patents in the United States to build factories and manufacture here for our trade or eventually forfeit the right to their patents.

#### CUBAN RECIPROCITY.

A section is inserted preserving the Cuban reciprocity provisions of the present law and treaty.

#### FOREIGN TRADE AGREEMENTS.

Provision is made to terminate the various commercial agreements with foreign countries, according to the terms of said agreements, by notice, and in the meantime keeping faith in those agreements. The provisions of section 4, applying the minimum and maximum rates, will take the place of section 3, under which these agreements were made.

#### CUSTOMS REVENUE.

The estimated revenue under the tariff duties prescribed in the bill amount to \$305,225,173.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE.

The bill provides for a tax on transfers of property, both real and personal, by inheritance or succession, and by will. It is believed that this provision, when in full operation, will bring in a revenue of \$20,000,000, although no accurate estimates can be made.

The tax on cigarettes is increased on those weighing over 3 pounds per thousand, from \$3 to \$3.60, and on those weighing less, from \$1 to \$1.50.

#### DRAWBACKS.

The bill contains a carefully prepared section (sec. 29) extending the privileges of drawback on material imported on which tariff has been paid and the products of which are manufactured in this country when exported. It is believed that this section carefully guards the revenue and at the same time liberalizes the provision and will stimulate our export trade.

#### TIME OF TAKING EFFECT.

It is provided that the bill shall go into effect the day following its enactment.

The bill contains provisions for the issue of bonds for the purchase of the Panama Canal, and also amends the provisions for issuing certificates of indebtedness, increasing the amount from \$100,000,000 to \$250,000,000.

The section of the present law prohibiting the importation of goods manufactured by convict labor is reenacted.

Provision is also made for countervailing duties where an export tax is levied on importations, equal to the duties imposed.

New provisions are included in the bill concerning the marking and branding of goods made abroad.

[House Report No. 1, part 2. Sixty-first Congress, first session.]

The report of six minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, to accompany H. R. 1438.

The undersigned members of the Ways and Means Committee present the following as their views on the bill (H. R. 1438) referred to said committee entitled "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes:"

A tariff is a tax paid by the consumer. The only proper and legitimate function of a tariff law is to raise revenue to supply the needs of the Government economically and effectively administered. The tariff should be so arranged as to bring into the Public Treasury the largest possible portion of the money taken from the pockets of the people by its operation, with the lowest rates or none at all on the necessities of life and on luxuries of life the highest consistent with the prevention of smuggling.

Under the rates of the Dingley bill, in many cases prohibitive, there is a large and constantly increasing deficiency in the revenues, which, according to the statement of Hon. JAMES A. TAWNEY, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations in the last two Congresses, is likely to amount to \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909. With this huge deficiency staring them in the face, the Sixtieth Congress at its short session made appropriations in excess of the billion-dollar mark for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, thereby achieving "the bad eminence" of breaking the record for extravagance. There are only three ways of curing a deficiency: (1) Cut down expenditures; (2) increase the taxes; (3) issue bonds. To cut down expenditures which the dominant party seems utterly unable to do is the wisest and most humane way to cure a deficiency. To increase taxes where it can be avoided is unjustifiable and unpatriotic. To issue bonds, thereby creating a new indebtedness, is simply postponing the evil day, for they must be paid at last with interest. The most easily understood feature of the Payne tariff bill is that it increases the authorization of the interest-bearing bonds from \$100,000,000 to

\$250,000,000 in any one year to run for that year, and that, too, in a period of profound peace. True, the framers of the Payne bill do not use the unpopular word "bond," but substitute therefor the more euphonious word "certificate," which will mislead nobody, for a "certificate" and a "bond" are one and the same—a distinction without a difference. We insist that instead of an increase of taxes or a new issue of interest-bearing certificates or bonds, the correct remedy for the growing deficiency in the revenues is the Jeffersonian principle of "economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened."

When the long and laborious "hearings" closed the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means segregated themselves from the Democratic members and spent almost three months in incubating the Payne tariff bill, though we would have gladly aided them in their investigations, meditations, and conclusions. We submit to all concerned that the posture of affairs would be better to-day perhaps had they invited us to join them in considering and framing the tariff bill. Inasmuch as we are laboring under the compulsion of increasing the revenues by something over \$150,000,000 per annum, because it seems impossible for a Republican Congress to reduce the appropriations, and inasmuch as we are in the unprecedented situation of both parties standing pledged to a revision of the tariff downward, such joint action would have been eminently proper. We might—who knows?—being in this amazing predicament, have agreed on a bill, if not in whole, then in part. The Democratic members did as much work during the "hearings" as did the Republican members, and were as patriotic and conscientious as they. In such a joint labor nobody would have placed in the bill all he wanted. Nor is it at all probable that even a single Republican member of the committee or of the House is entirely satisfied with the Payne bill as reported, to say nothing of the Democratic members. In such a joint labor there could have been no danger of our outvoting them. If the whole committee could have united on a bill, either in whole or in part, under the peculiar circumstances in which we find ourselves, it would have greatly expedited the passage of the bill, thereby relieving the country of the long and wearisome weeks, perhaps months, of business uncertainty and suspense. If there is delay in the passage of the bill and business stagnates by reason thereof and financial loss results from it, let the blame be placed where it properly belongs, upon the head of the Republican party.

Having spent nearly three months in framing their bill, they graciously called in the Democratic members, and in precisely twelve minutes reported it back to the House without one moment's discussion, without changing a word, without even reading the title—an astounding demonstration of the fact that we live in a fast age and are traveling at a rapid gait.

This happened on March 18, and no member of the minority had ever seen the bill or any paragraph thereof till noon on Wednesday, the 17th of March, and had not the remotest idea of its provisions, except by the merest guesswork. In fact, it was currently reported in the public press that so fearful were the Republican members that the Democratic members or some other American citizen might secure some knowledge of the contents of the Payne bill that its authors not only kept it under lock and key, but employed armed guards to keep watch and ward over their precious bantling—an absolutely superfluous performance, as many parts of it are utterly incomprehensible even after careful study. And yet this bill, which was too sacred for any eyes except the 12 majority members and a few of their trusted friends, contains 234 large pages and deals with tariff taxes on about 4,000 articles of everyday consumption, influencing the interests, prosperity, and happiness of 90,000,000 American citizens, and involving our trade relations with the whole world. We have had only five days in which to consider and report upon a bill which they spent nearly three months in preparing.

There are many changes—for the most part minor changes—of the Dingley rates, some up and some down. Most of the changes in a downward direction are reductions more apparent than real, the Payne rates being as prohibitive in their results in many cases as the Dingley rates. In some of the schedules containing the most exorbitant rates there are no changes giving any appreciable relief to the great body of consumers. This omission is notable in the rates on manufactures of wool, which in our changeable climate are absolutely necessary to human comfort. The only noteworthy change in the rates on manufactures of wool is that in the Payne bill a lower rate is put on tops than upon yarn, as it should be, whereas in the Dingley bill the rate upon tops is higher than upon yarns—a gross outrage, as yarns are a grade higher as manufactures than tops.

Nevertheless, the squabble about the relative rates on tops and yarns was of interest only to the makers of tops and the spinners of yarns, a fight of absolutely no consequence to the consumer, for he will in any event experience no reduction in the price of the woollen goods which he buys, because the tariff taxes under the Payne bill are almost identical with those under the Dingley bill. No man, woman or child will ever have cause to thank the framers of the Payne bill for cheaper and more abundant clothes and blankets.

Most of the rates on manufactured wool in both the Dingley and Payne bills are compound; that is, made up of both specific and ad valorem duties, and many of them are practically prohibitive. It is this compounding of specific and ad valorem rates which so puzzles and boggles the average citizen as to what tariff rates he is really paying. Here are a few samples of the rates on woollen manufactures, when both the specific rates and the ad valorem are reduced to ad valorem rates:

Paragraph 375 of the Payne bill, which is identical with paragraph 367 of the Dingley bill, runs as follows:

"On blankets and flannels for underwear, composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be the same as the duty imposed by this section on 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. On blankets, composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels, composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 5 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duty as women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character and description provided by this section: *Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths."

The specific duty on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class is 11 cents; consequently on a pound of blankets or flannels worth not



more than 40 cents per pound the specific duty is 22 cents. This never varies, but to that is added the 30 per cent ad valorem, which does vary. In practice the result is that on that class of blankets and flannels the compound duties when reduced to ad valorem duties ran as low as \$8.65 per cent in 1899 and as high as 125.10 per cent in 1901, and fell to 107.60 per cent in 1907, the last year for which we have the figures. These are the cheapest blankets and flannels. To show how nearly prohibitive those rates are, it is only necessary to state that in 1907 we imported that kind of blankets and flannels to the value of \$316 only, and the tariff on the same amounted to \$340.32. On blankets and flannels valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound the rate in 1907 was 106.12 per cent ad valorem, of which we imported \$219 worth only and upon which we paid \$232.41 tariff.

On blankets and flannels more than 3 yards in length valued at not more than 40 cents per pound the rates in both the Dingley and Payne bills are 33 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem, which in operation amounted in 1907 to 165.42 and in 1906 to 182.71 per cent. In 1907 we imported blankets and flannels of that kind of the infinitesimal value of \$40.60, on which we paid tariff duties to the amount of \$67.16. Yet the framers of the Payne bill, for some inscrutable reason, let these prohibitive rates stand at a time when the deficiency in the revenues is startling and worrying the country. Why not give the consumers cheaper blankets and flannels and at the same time replenish the Treasury? How can any man believe, or how can any man claim, that the Payne bill is a bona fide revision downward while it contains such monstrous provisions as those just cited? Many other such rates in the woolen-manufactures schedule could be pointed out, but these are fair samples and must suffice.

We are told that the reduction of five one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound on refined sugar is a great boon to the ultimate consumer. The public press informs us that one of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means describes this reduction as "a blow between the eyes of the sugar trust." When the trust received that blow between the eyes, instead of seeing stars, the usual and natural result of such a blow, it saw a golden stream like unto the river Pactolus flowing steadily into its coffers during the entire life of the Payne bill. To show how pitiful this boon really is, let it be remembered that the annual per capita consumption of sugar in this country is about 80 pounds; so that a person would be compelled to eat sugar at the top of his speed in order to save one nickel in fifteen months, even if the trust should be compelled to reduce the price of sugar by five one-hundredths of a cent per pound, which most assuredly it would not be. Theoretically the trust receives "a blow between the eyes." In reality this infinitesimal reduction of the Dingley rate will not reduce the price of refined sugar—a prime necessary of life—to the consumer in any degree whatsoever. Certainly that reduction may be properly denominated as a "sham."

The Standard Oil Company is as handsomely cared for in the Payne bill as in the Dingley bill, and by reason of the proviso in paragraph 637, popularly known as "the joker," continues to be protected by a tariff duty of about 99 per cent, which enables it to dominate and exploit the American market and to levy tribute upon the public, thereby piling up millions of dollars of ill-gotten gains. Surely the Standard Oil, which openly and constantly defies the law, needs no protection from the Government to enable it to take care of itself; and the countervailing duty ought to be repealed.

#### SCHEDULE A.

In the chemical schedule we find a very general reduction in the rates. An attempt has been made to produce something like a scientific arrangement and to bring order out of existing chaos in this schedule.

The cuts in rates seem to us not sufficiently extensive in all particulars to produce the most revenue. There are, moreover, not a few items in which no reduction has been made and in which there appears to be a thus far unexplained desire to favor a trust. There are, however, certain increases of rates in this schedule which are unjustifiable from any point of view.

#### GLASS. (B.)

Referring to paragraph 97 (common window glass), the reduction proposed of one-eighth of 1 cent per pound on sizes exceeding 720 square inches enables the statement to be made that there is a reduction on common window glass and that is as far as one can go. The reduction amounts to 3 or 4 per cent in duty on 6 or 7 per cent of the importations, or less than one-half of 1 per cent on the importations as a whole. As for revenue, it is obvious that the proposed slight change will have no special effect one way or the other. The only way to get revenue out of this schedule is to reduce the rates materially.

French glass is imported mainly on account of its superiority for special purposes. Comparatively very few buyers will pay the present difference in price. At a decreased margin between French and American glass the consumption would undoubtedly increase enormously. Aside from this, it is not fair to the American consumer to offer a premium for the formation of an industrial combination in this article behind the shelter of a tariff wall equal on the average to the entire cost of production in this country. A fair rate to the American manufacturer could be adopted that would give some relief to the consumer and at the same time increase the revenue.

Taking up paragraph 100 (polished plate glass), the proposed rates are neither in accordance with the theory of equalizing the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, nor with revenue considerations. The difference in the cost of production here and abroad is shown to be less than 3½ cents per square foot, whereas the proposed rates figure out at about 15 cents per square foot on the average consumption. There is a small importation of foreign plate glass which will probably continue to enter the country at any rate of duty within reason. The great bulk of the importation, however, consists of glass that the American manufacturer can and does keep out whenever he wants to. Witness the shrinkage of importations of plate glass during the calendar year 1908 as compared with 1907. During this period plate-glass importations decreased 79 per cent, window-glass importations only 31 per cent, and rough rolled glass 36 per cent. The decrease in the last two items was principally due to depressed business conditions. The decrease in plate glass was partly due to this cause, but the proportionate decrease as compared with the two other varieties of building glass demonstrated how large a proportion of the present importations can be kept out by the American manufacturer under the present rates on small sizes, which are 8 and 10 cents per square foot. At the proposed advanced rates the decrease in importations would counterbalance several times over the increase in the rate of duty; in fact, there would not be any importations worth mentioning

until the American consumer had first paid the additional tax of 25 per cent of the duty on all the small sizes consumed in the country, and even then the importations would be far less than in past years, for, while French plate glass is imported principally on account of its quality, even good quality can be taxed out of existence.

The reduction proposed in the rate of duty on the large sizes exceeding 1,440 square inches will not yield an increase in revenue, as the proposed rate of 22½ cents is still practically prohibitive and is even more unreasonable in its relationship to comparative cost than the proposed rates on the smaller sizes.

The remaining paragraphs—98, 99, 101, and 102—are comparatively of minor importance, as compared with the plate and window glass schedules. In most of these paragraphs there is no change from the present rates in the newly proposed rates. What slight changes have been made are apparent and not real reductions, as there is practically no importation in the items in which changes have been made.

#### SCHEDULE C.

The reduction of duties on iron and steel commodities are more numerous and in some particular instances apparently more far-reaching than any in the bill, but a close examination will show that many of these reductions are only on the surface and not real. In other instances the reductions are made in the interests of the manufacturer and not in the interests of the government revenue or the consumer.

On many articles of manufactured iron and steel, where the rates are now prohibitive, a reduction has been made. This is true of steel ingots, blooms, slabs, round iron and steel wire, and a number of other articles. Again, there are articles left in the bill on which the rates are as prohibitive as under the Dingley law, allowing very little of importations, raising practically no revenue, and barring out competition. Notable among these are rivets, screw, fence, and other wire rods, axles, axle bars, blacksmiths' hammers, sledges, track tools, wedges, crowbars, bolt blanks, cast-iron vessels, stove plate, sadirons, muskets, shotguns, rifles, nails, spikes, tacks, needles, steel plates engraved, stereotype plates, electrotype plates, hooks and eyes, and many other articles named in the schedule.

It is apparent, from a careful reading of this schedule, that in those cases where the interest of the manufacturer of high-grade material demanded a cut a reduction in his favor has been made; in cases like steel rails, where the eyes of the country were watching to see what would be done, an apparent reduction has been made, but in very many cases in this schedule it is as radically a prohibitive tariff as it was in the beginning and the changes in the schedule will undoubtedly not materially increase the revenues.

#### SCHEDULE G.

The treatment of the farmer by this bill is along the same lines as have characterized Republican methods in the past. He gets practically no relief, and the laborer and producer have greater burdens imposed upon them. The cost of living for the average man is increased; the advantage of wealth and power is also increased. Heavy taxes are laid on coffee, tea, and substitutes for coffee, which, with cocoa, butter, mustard, pepper, cinnamon, and all sorts of flavors for foods, are declared to be luxuries. While figs, lemons, etc., are raised in price without hope of increasing the revenue, barley is reduced 15 cents and barley malt 20 cents, the reason for which it would be interesting to know. Every article of food the laborer must have to live comfortably is heavily taxed; even the salt on his table is not exempt. This schedule was evidently prepared by the same mind which has dominated this bill—a mind certainly not unfriendly to the great trusts.

As this bill places hides on the free list, to be consistent it should also remove the duty on leather, shoes, harness, and other manufactures of leather.

That the bill is a sectional one is shown by the failure of the majority of the committee to lift any burden whatever from the shoulders of the southern farmer. The grower of cotton must sell his product in the open markets of the world. In order, however, to benefit the manufacturer of cotton the Republican party makes him pay a heavy tax on every pound of it that is exported and comes back into the United States in the shape of manufactured goods. Thus he sells in free-trade markets and buys in a protected market. Not only have these burdens not been lifted, but additional ones have been placed on him. By a lately discovered process a fabric known as "mercerized fabric" is now being made. This is a very fine article of cotton goods, looking very much like silk, and is largely worn. In order to further enrich the manufacturer and to further tax the masses of the people a tax has been laid on these goods.

Cotton hose have fallen under their greedy gaze, and the tax on them, already too much, has been greatly increased. Cotton goods are more generally used than any other class of goods by the masses of the American people and every cent of duty laid on such fabrics is an additional tax on the people least able to pay it.

The tea tariff is a tax of 8 and 9 cents per pound on consumption, and is in direct contradiction of that "free breakfast table" about the blessings of which we heard so much when raw sugar was put on the free list in the McKinley bill. If a free breakfast table was a desirable thing in 1890, and it undoubtedly was, it is an equally desirable thing now. This tea tax will probably bring into the Treasury something like \$7,000,000 per annum, and it increases the cost of living by the same amount. That sum, or twice or thrice that sum, could have been added to the revenues by reducing the exorbitant rates on woolen manufactures alone, and at the same time reducing the cost of living, which has increased to an alarming extent in the last few years.

In paragraph 553 as to coffee we find another joker similar to the one as to petroleum. Ostensibly coffee is placed on the free list, but by reason of the proviso as to countervailing duties, it really places a tariff on coffee equal to the export duty levied upon it by the exporting country from which it comes. For example, if Brazil levies an export duty of 8 or 10 cents per pound, then we must clap a tariff rate of 8 or 10 cents a pound on all coffee imported from Brazil, which arrangement really authorizes Brazil and other coffee-exporting countries to fix our tariff duties on coffee. This may be a delightful situation for the coffee-exporting countries and for our Treasury Department, but it will not bring joy to the heart of the American coffee consumer, who must pay both the export duty levied by the other countries and the import duty levied by our own Government.

Indeed, the whole maximum and minimum tariff scheme as set forth in the Payne bill enables foreign countries to force us to raise the rates of the Payne schedules 20 per cent, which would, after making ample allowance for all reductions in the Payne bill, increase our tariff rates on the average much above the rates of the Dingley law, a prospect which will bring sorrow and dismay to the great body of the people. We are most heartily in favor of such a maximum and minimum tariff as will enable our Government to negotiate tariff arrangements by

making concessions to other governments by reducing the rates of the statute when such other countries will make equally valuable concessions to us. The maximum rates should be the rates of our statute, whatever they are, and the minimum a reasonable rate below our statutory rates; but as it stands the maximum and minimum tariff plan of the Payne bill is an open challenge to a trade war with every other nation on earth. It is seeking trade with a club or meat ax. We are opposed to such an unwise and unnecessary performance. In this connection it may be well to ponder thoroughly our relations with Cuba. Does any sane man suppose for one moment that the great commercial nations, our competitors for the world's trade, will concede that Cuba is one of our "dependencies?" It is a thing incredible. To ask that question is to answer it.

The tariff arrangement between us and the Philippine Islands has no proper place in a general tariff bill. The legitimate function of a general tariff bill is to set forth our trade relations with foreign nations, but foreign nations have absolutely nothing to do with our relations to the Philippines, which relations should be most carefully and prayerfully considered by us in a separate bill.

There are some schedules and many items which we have been absolutely precluded from considering by the short space of time allowed for the examination of this voluminous bill and the preparation of this report. On them we pronounce no opinion, and as to them we make no suggestion at this time; but our silence as to them is not to be construed into an indorsement, for the chances are that they are as objectionable as those which we have discussed in this report.

The bill is in many respects crude, indefinite, sectional, and prohibitive. It seems to us from our examination, which was necessarily hasty, that on the whole it increases the cost of living. For example, it will increase the price of hosiery about 30 per cent, and certainly nobody will claim that hosiery is a luxury in this day and generation. Many increases of the sort might be mentioned. In numerous instances the protection exceeds the entire labor cost of production. This can not be defended on any ground whatsoever, even by a standpatter. In all, the reductions, both apparent and real, fall far short of the substantial relief which the people were led to expect.

We do not desire to delay the passage of the tariff bill, and do not propose to waste an hour; but, having had no opportunity whatsoever to modify or amend it before it was reported, we will insist on having full opportunity to amend and debate it paragraph by paragraph under the five-minute rule, as is right and proper. That much we demand. We will be satisfied with nothing less.

CHAMP CLARK.  
O. W. UNDERWOOD.  
J. M. GRIGGS.  
EDWARD W. POUL.  
C. B. RANDELL.  
FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a statement of papers and documents not needed in the transaction of the public business (H. Doc. No. 3)—to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of taking the census (H. Doc. No. 5)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for payments to special assistant attorneys (H. Doc. No. 6)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a schedule of useless papers on the files of his department (H. Doc. No. 7)—to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John T. Ayres, executor, against the United States and the Chickasaw Nation (H. Doc. No. 8)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 3039) for the establishment of a national tubercular sanitarium in the State of Colorado for persons afflicted with tuberculosis—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3040) to increase the efficiency of the army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 3041) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and

with foreign nations and to remove obstructions thereto—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 3042) to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy known as the "Squadron of Evolution," and entitled "Peace"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 3043) to erect a monument on the Missisniewa battle ground, in Grant County, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3044) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Huntington, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 3045) providing for the erection of a public building at Boonville, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3046) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Oregon City, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 3048) to raise the wreck of the U. S. battle ship *Maine* in Habana Harbor, and remove the bodies therein to Arlington Cemetery for interment—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 3049) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Three Rivers, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) permitting the construction of a ship canal between Lakes Michigan and Superior, by way of Whitefish River, Mud Lake, and Au Train River and Lake, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) to protect national banking associations from libel and slander—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) to amend section 2139 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 3055) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter of the first class for service at the port of New London, Conn., and adjacent waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3056) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1907—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) to establish in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) to regulate the issuance of restraining orders and injunctions and procedure thereon and to limit the meaning of conspiracy in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 3059) to require clerks of the courts of record of the United States to keep a public record, to be called a judgment docket, prescribing its nature and contents, and providing for the taxation of fees for the services of the clerks—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 3060) for the erection of a public building at Hendersonville, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 3061) providing for the erection, either by this Government alone or jointly with such other nations and peoples as may voluntarily cooperate therein, of a memorial light-house to commemorate the work and achievements of the late Matthew Fontaine Maury, and for the creation of a commission to take up this subject with other nations and peoples, and appropriating for the expense of the same—to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) to construct a road from the national cemetery in Shelby County, Tenn., to the eastern bound-



any line of the city of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) for the suppression of gambling on horse races through national and interstate commerce and the postal service, subject to the jurisdiction and the laws of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3064) requiring railroads and other common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to make prompt acknowledgment and adjustment of claims for overcharge on freight, and for loss and injury to same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Covington, Tipton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 3066) to provide for acquisition, by condemnation, of lands at Cape Henry, Va., for the purpose of fortification and coast defense—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) granting permission to the Lynnhaven Terminal Corporation to improve the lower Chesapeake and Lynnhaven Bay by the construction of a breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) to provide a uniform rate of salaries and wages paid in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the bureau of public highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3071) to establish a light-ship at a point about 6 miles east of Cape Henry, Va.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3072) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase of a lot of land on Hampton Roads, Virginia, and the buildings, structures, piers, and improvements thereon, for the use of the Navy Department of the United States as a naval training station and a coaling station, and for other governmental purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3073) to fix the compensation of light-house keepers and to provide for their retirement on half pay—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 3074) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station on the bank of the reservoir in Mercer or Auglaize County, State of Ohio—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3075) prohibiting the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes and the sale thereof—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) making appropriation for the construction and equipment of a Weather Bureau observatory at Lima, Ohio—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) to place agricultural implements upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) to place binding twine and all material used in making or manufacturing the same upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) to repeal the duty on printing paper, wood pulp, and all materials used in the manufacture of printing paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 3080) to provide for the erection of a monument to Thaddeus Stevens—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3081) providing for the erection of a public building at Lock Haven, Clinton County, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3082) for the erection of a federal building for the post-office at Duquoin, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3083) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war, the war with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3084) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and

to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved June 29, 1906, and as amended by an act approved April 13, 1908—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3627) to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3628) for the erection of a monument to Gen. James Moore upon Moores Creek battle ground, North Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 3629) authorizing a survey of Pearl River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 3630) to provide for site and public building at Lewistown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Lewistown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) to provide for site and public building at Lewisburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Lewisburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) to provide for site and public building at Huntingdon, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Huntingdon, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned brass or bronze "Napoleon" guns, carriages, and cannon balls to the Grand Army Post at Lewistown, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) authorizing the appointment of three additional army chaplains—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LASSITER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to the term of service of the President of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 7) directing the Secretary of War to cause to be made an investigation of the lines of investment and defense around Petersburg, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A resolution (H. Res. 42) amending Rule XXXII—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A resolution (H. Res. 43) appropriating \$300 each to certain employees of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 8) asking the Secretary of State for information relative to the lack of representation of the cotton-growing States in the diplomatic and consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to create in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "civil war soldiers' roll"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to remove the tariff from lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, concerning waterways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to refuse revenue licenses for the sale of intoxicants to be used as a beverage in States and portions thereof where laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors are in force—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to provide for the return of discharged soldiers and sailors from the Battle Mountain Sanatorium, Hot Springs, S. Dak., to their homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to create in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "civil war soldiers' roll"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, on waterways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to provide for the return of discharged soldiers and

sailors from the Battle Mountain Sanatorium, Hot Springs, S. Dak., to their homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to remove the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the legislature of South Dakota, asking Congress to refuse revenue licenses for the sale of intoxicants to be used as a beverage in States and portions thereof where laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors are in force—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 3085) granting an increase of pension to Ralph G. Bergemann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) to correct the muster of William N. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 3087) granting a pension to Arabella M. Marks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Holliday, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Thatcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 3091) granting an increase of pension to James H. Roundy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Davey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3093) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Libbey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Owen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) granting a pension to M. Emily Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3096) granting a pension to Roy Riley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 3097) granting a pension to Ann Rager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Stone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) granting an increase of pension to Joel W. Adkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Anders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) granting an increase of pension to Wilson H. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) granting an increase of pension to William L. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) granting an increase of pension to William A. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) granting an increase of pension to William A. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Wipff, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) granting an increase of pension to James P. H. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) granting an increase of pension to James F. Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah G. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) granting an increase of pension to Emil F. Wurzbach—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) granting an increase of pension to David A. T. Walton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3112) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) granting an increase of pension to William O. Tumlinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) granting an increase of pension to Hermann W. Toepperwein—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) granting an increase of pension to H. Simpson Tom—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) granting an increase of pension to George W. Tom—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) granting an increase of pension to Velerius P. Sanders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Sparks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) granting an increase of pension to Robert Schaefer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shelton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) granting an increase of pension to Josephus Sparrow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3122) granting an increase of pension to Israel S. Standefer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) granting an increase of pension to Gustav H. Schmeltzer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin N. Shropshire—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) granting an increase of pension to William B. Reagan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) granting an increase of pension to Marion M. Redmon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) granting an increase of pension to John Y. Rankin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) granting an increase of pension to Gilford Ratliff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3130) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Rainbolt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) granting an increase of pension to William W. Parker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3132) granting an increase of pension to Robert Parsons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) granting an increase of pension to Green B. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3134) granting an increase of pension to George S. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Petmecky—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3136) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Patton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Nehaus—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3138) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Nimitz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) granting an increase of pension to Lewellen Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Moss—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mahavier—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3143) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. McElrath—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3144) granting an increase of pension to James McMorries—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3145) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKinzie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) granting an increase of pension to David McFadden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Lackey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) granting an increase of pension to Levi D. Ladd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) granting an increase of pension to James M. Low—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) granting an increase of pension to George W. Light—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) granting an increase of pension to John J. Jacobs—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kennedy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) granting an increase of pension to Polk R. Kyle—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3156) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. D. Kolb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3157) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. King—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) granting an increase of pension to William B. King—to the Committee on Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) granting an increase of pension to Anthony L. Houston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) granting an increase of pension to Valentine Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) granting an increase of pension to Cullen C. Ratliff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) granting an increase of pension to John H. Blair—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. McGehee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bingham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bonner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) granting an increase of pension to James S. Bigham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to James Besser—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Burleson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) granting an increase of pension to Anton L. Berger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) granting an increase of pension to Alfred G. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) granting an increase of pension to Abner H. Beard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Awbrey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) granting an increase of pension to John F. Arnett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Huff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3176) granting an increase of pension to Montraville Harrell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Hurley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3179) granting an increase of pension to William Hurst—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Frank Jenull—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) granting an increase of pension to John W. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to John Hutchinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3186) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Holt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Hill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Hubert—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) granting an increase of pension to Alfred House—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) granting an increase of pension to William R. Gregg—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) granting an increase of pension to Wenceslao Garza—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) granting an increase of pension to John R. Gibbons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Mortimer Gibony—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Emory Gibbons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Goodnight—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting an increase of pension to Ben F. Gooch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting an increase of pension to William B. Fleming—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Fitzhugh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) granting an increase of pension to John M. Fleming—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) granting an increase of pension to Adam H. Files—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Eller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) granting an increase of pension to James Eastwood—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Ellis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Earp—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting an increase of pension to John H. Debord—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wesley Danley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Dye—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3208) granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3209) granting an increase of pension to William A. Cole—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3210) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Capell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) granting an increase of pension to Robert Carson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas N. Cox—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) granting an increase of pension to John Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) granting an increase of pension to John Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) granting an increase of pension to Jerry C. Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) granting an increase of pension to James Conner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Chapman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting an increase of pension to Elijah S. Close—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Cotton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) granting an increase of pension to William H. Baxter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3221) granting an increase of pension to Milton C. Baird—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boles—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 3223) to authorize the Kaw tribe of Indians residing in the State of Oklahoma to bring suit in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 3224) for the relief of Julia T. W. Furlong, executrix of estate of Thomas Wrenn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alice E. Davis, heir at law of John C. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 3227) granting an increase of pension to John Watters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) granting an increase of pension to George B. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Blessing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) granting an increase of pension to George L. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Britton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3233) granting an increase of pension to Marlon P. Downey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Alvy Degood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3235) granting an increase of pension to Loammie Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) granting an increase of pension to Ella F. Stoddard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3238) granting an increase of pension to Julius A. Southwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) granting an increase of pension to David W. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Surface—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Parmenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting an increase of pension to William McMannis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting an increase of pension to Delano Morey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting a pension to Thomas J. Mullin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to John C. F. Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. L. Meredith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) granting an increase of pension to William McAdams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Lease—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harbottle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) granting an increase of pension to William F. Galbreath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) granting an increase of pension to John Gumpert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) granting a pension to Henrietta Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) granting a pension to Allen C. Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) granting a pension to Almira W. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) granting a pension to Minerva E. Banning Sherer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) granting a pension to Dock W. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3258) granting a pension to Louie E. Read—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) granting a pension to John Ogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) granting a pension to Richard M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to Sarah E. Helpman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) granting a pension to Sophronia Gaunts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3263) granting a pension to Lydia B. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) for the relief of Isaiah Heylin McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3265) for the relief of the estate of John H. Platt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3266) to correct the military record of John J. Troxell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) to correct the military record of Thomas Moffett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) to correct the military record of Lanson Zane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 3269) granting an increase of pension to Lewis N. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Stogsdill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3271) granting an increase of pension to Levi Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) granting an increase of pension to John Bonhome—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3274) granting a pension to Ida F. Hanson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3275) granting a pension to Pernetta J. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) granting a pension to Susan F. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3277) granting a pension to Lola C. Hanson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3278) granting a pension to Ida E. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3279) for the relief of Andrew Wilkinson and William D. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 3280) granting a pension to Charles A. Brayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3281) granting a pension to Paul Cariker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3282) granting a pension to William Lay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) granting a pension to Daniel Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) granting a pension to W. L. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3285) granting a pension to G. P. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) granting a pension to James Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) to correct the military record of James H. Cowan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) to correct the military record of William Green Mhoon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) to correct the military record of Richard A. Hutson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) to correct the military record of McDonald Meade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) for the relief of Leonard Keeling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOELKER: A bill (H. R. 3292) granting a pension to Altha M. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) granting an increase of pension to William F. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 3294) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 3295) granting an increase of pension to John Leitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 3296) granting a pension to Fred M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) for the relief of the legal representatives of William W. Miller, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 3298) granting a pension to Mary A. Hoppen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) granting an increase of pension to Robert Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Posey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 3301) granting an increase of pension to Louis Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3303) to correct the military record of Isaac J. Reese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 3304) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) granting an increase of pension to Earl S. Cranston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) to correct the military record of Dwight Bromley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 3308) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) granting an increase of pension to John T. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) granting an increase of pension to Byron C. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) granting an increase of pension to Lee Lafavor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to John W. McAdams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) granting an increase of pension to Augustus W. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3315) granting an increase of pension to James Pritchitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting an increase of pension to William F. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) granting an increase of pension to Burkett F. Starnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) granting an increase of pension to James Smithson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus P. M. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) granting a pension to Paul Kerr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) granting a pension to William Edward Prater—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) granting a pension to James B. Prosser—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3323) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Bishard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) granting an increase of pension to Moses L. Bunnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) granting an increase of pension to James H. D. Bostwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) granting an increase of pension to John J. Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) granting an increase of pension to George O. Steadman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) granting an increase of pension to William H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Mohler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3330) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Bennington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3331) granting an increase of pension to James M. Hobson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3332) granting an increase of pension to Wyman J. Crow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) granting an increase of pension to George H. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) granting an increase of pension to Ira Waldo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3335) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Coons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) granting an increase of pension to John M. Cochran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) granting an increase of pension to F. Loehle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3338) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Christofel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3340) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Summey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) granting an increase of pension to William L. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) granting a pension to Joseph D. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) granting a pension to Miller C. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) granting a pension to Edward Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3345) granting a pension to Amy A. T. Silcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3346) for the relief of Frank E. Lyman, jr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) for the relief of John Kline—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3348) for the relief of James McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) to correct the military record of Robert F. Shugart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3350) to correct the military record of John N. Gadd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Dockstader—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOYCE: A bill (H. R. 3352) granting an increase of pension to John C. Griggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) granting an increase of pension to Wood C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) granting an increase of pension to William H. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 3356) granting an increase of pension to William J. Manning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) granting an increase of pension to John H. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) granting a pension to Henry F. Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) granting a pension to Mary E. O'Neill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) granting a pension to Harry Menovitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) granting a pension to Ellen M. Brennan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 3362) to correct the military record of George W. Stape—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 3363) to have the name of Robert Galbert changed on the records of the Navy Department to Robert Galbraith—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 3364) granting an increase of pension to John Fitzeriter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 3365) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 3366) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3367) granting an increase of pension to Allen Albert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADISON: A bill (H. R. 3368) granting an increase of pension to James R. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) granting an increase of pension to James F. McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) granting an increase of pension to David Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3372) granting an increase of pension to William C. M. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) granting an increase of pension to John Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) granting an increase of pension to William J. Seals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) granting an increase of pension to John J. Garr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Haggerty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Alvaro B. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) granting an increase of pension to Milo P. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) granting a pension to Martha M. Wilson Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) granting a pension to Fleming C. Maupin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) granting a pension to Mollie J. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) for the relief of William Walters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) for the relief of Jonson Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) to restore John F. Lewis to the United States Army with the rank of captain of infantry and place him upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 3386) for the relief of the Seaboard Air Line Railway—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3387) granting an increase of pension to John L. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 3388) granting an increase of pension to James H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) granting an increase of pension to Newton J. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) granting an increase of pension to William Misner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) granting an increase of pension to Wyatt Botts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) granting an increase of pension to Noble Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3393) granting a pension to Edward A. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 3394) for the relief of Levi J. Billings—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) for the relief of Axel Jacobson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 3396) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) granting an increase of pension to Stephen L. Freel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Jeffries—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3400) granting an increase of pension to Peter Brechner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Carlisle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3402) granting an increase of pension to William Harrold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) granting an increase of pension to John W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) granting an increase of pension to Uzee Bump—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3405) granting an increase of pension to Orley B. Giffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3406) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) granting an increase of pension to John Vctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) granting an increase of pension to John N. Frazee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) granting an increase of pension to George Henson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) granting an increase of pension to Christopher U. Rump—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) granting an increase of pension to Abram J. Hendershot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bolner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) granting an increase of pension to James M. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) granting an increase of pension to William Fosler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) granting an increase of pension to James B. Kenner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lowry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) granting an increase of pension to Elias D. Carnahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Schroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) granting an increase of pension to William B. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Godschalk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) granting an increase of pension to John Stambaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bremercamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3425) granting an increase of pension to John W. Keiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3426) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cameron, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta S. Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) granting an increase of pension to George Forst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) granting an increase of pension to David C. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) granting an increase of pension to James Chaplin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Pullman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) granting an increase of pension to George W. Whitacre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) granting an increase of pension to Henry Creery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3434) granting a pension to William T. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) granting a pension to Robert A. Talbott—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3436) granting a pension to Gertrude Balou—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3437) granting a pension to William Swift Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3438) granting a pension to Mrs. Alfred H. Clawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) granting a pension to Stephen Strange—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) granting a pension to Annie Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) granting a pension to Clarinda H. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3442) granting a pension to William Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) granting a pension to Mary J. Brophy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) to correct the military record of William Shingler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) to correct the military record of John Daly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) to correct the military record of John Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) to correct the military record of Adam K. Danes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) to correct the military record of Ralph Cloud—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) to correct the military record of Valentine Durkes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) to correct the military record of Joseph Elshire—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) to correct the military record of Samuel Dailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) to correct the military record of Harvey Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) authorizing the payment of a claim to Toliyar B. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) to amend the records of the War Department as to Paul L. Bahr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) to amend the records of the War Department as to Oliver Capron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 3456) granting an increase of pension to H. A. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) granting an increase of pension to Gustav Weil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3458) granting an increase of pension to Laura Cranson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) granting an increase of pension to William Ridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) granting an increase of pension to Leonard A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Hal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) granting an increase of pension to Allen Benson Hodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3465) granting a pension to Clara Zellar Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 3466) for the relief of John H. Layne—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3467) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 3468) granting a pension to Nannie Vanarsdall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 3469) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wieser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3471) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3472) granting an increase of pension to Henry Collett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3474) granting an increase of pension to Nathan S. Parson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Barnhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) granting an increase of pension to William A. Mullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) granting an increase of pension to David Fritz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) granting an increase of pension to David E. Niswonger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3480) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Wrights—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting an increase of pension to John Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Nonnamaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) granting an increase of pension to William Briney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) granting an increase of pension to William L. Reck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to James H. Shafer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Nonnamaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) granting an increase of pension to Harvey D. Parmenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3493) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3494) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Bunch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Workman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) granting a pension to August Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3497) granting a pension to Mary F. Hess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) granting a pension to William Runkel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shockey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) granting a pension to James A. Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to Levi E. Chenoweth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting a pension to George Schneider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) granting a pension to Arvilla Boop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting a pension to Scott Wilkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) for the relief of George R. Gary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) for the relief of David W. Stockstill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) for the relief of Henry S. Call—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) for the relief of Egbert S. Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John M. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3510) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Austin Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3511) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Frank Chronaberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Hezekiah R. Hubbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of George S. Simon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3514) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick Dieker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) granting an honorable discharge to Ferdinand Tobe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHBURN: A bill (H. R. 3516) granting an increase of pension to John Feaghy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lesselyoung—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Jacobi—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Windecker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) granting an increase of pension to August Schwartz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) granting an increase of pension to John G. Beardsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Tredway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) granting an increase of pension to Caleb W. Brigham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting an increase of pension to Elias A. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) granting a pension to Rosetta Maria Johanna Tischer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 3526) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Franklin Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Missemmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Morrissey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting an increase of pension to David H. Mumma—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting an increase of pension to James T. Naylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) granting an increase of pension to John Person—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) granting an increase of pension to Stephen W. Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) granting an increase of pension to William Presley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Reuter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rudy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) granting an increase of pension to James L. Seebold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Sheets—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Smink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3539) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3541) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3542) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Sollenberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann E. Sperry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3544) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting an increase of pension to Solomon W. Tobias—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting an increase of pension to John Trout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) granting an increase of pension to John A. Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3548) granting an increase of pension to E. L. Witman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Witmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Meredith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Melly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) granting an increase of pension to John McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) granting an increase of pension to William Lukens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to William Lebo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Laysen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kimmel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Killinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Jordon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting an increase of pension to William F. Hummelbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) granting an increase of pension to William Hampton, sr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) granting an increase of pension to Martha Groner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Gratz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) granting an increase of pension to John S. Givler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Hunt Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Garland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) granting an increase of pension to Joanna R. Forster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Fegan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) granting an increase of pension to Robert Enis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) granting an increase of pension to Mattie J. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting an increase of pension to Jared Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3572) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Billig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Benner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) granting an increase of pension to John Bender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Harry Beitzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) granting a pension to Margaret Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) granting a pension to Catherine B. Peffley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3578) granting a pension to Silas W. Rank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) granting a pension to Charles C. Rumpf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) granting a pension to Martin P. Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) granting a pension to Mary Shiffler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) granting a pension to John S. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting a pension to Richard M. Steckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) granting a pension to Charles E. Stock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) granting a pension to Annetta Vale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) granting a pension to Henry S. Matter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) granting a pension to George W. Lehman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) granting a pension to Katherine E. Kemble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) granting a pension to Kate E. Keiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) granting a pension to Eliza Isele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) granting a pension to Mary Idle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) granting a pension to Emma Handshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) granting a pension to John P. M. Haas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) granting a pension to John W. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3595) granting a pension to Lucetta C. Graffius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3596) granting a pension to Catherine B. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) granting a pension to George W. Ennery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting a pension to John D. Deihl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) granting a pension to Sarah Culp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3600) granting a pension to George W. Brenise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) granting a pension to Harry R. Bentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) granting a pension to Mrs. George Armour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) granting a pension to Jacob Ambrose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) to correct the military record of Charles Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) to correct the military record of David Polm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) to correct the military record of Alexander C. Landis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3607) to correct the military record of John F. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) to correct the military record of John F. Geist—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) to correct the military record of Lieut. John W. Geiger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3610) to correct the military record of Philip D. Beidel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Brininger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Frederick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Neidinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Reuben Seler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Leitzel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Windowmaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Tomlinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Levi Sheetz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) for the relief of John C. Colwell, captain on the retired list of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) for the relief of James E. Cann, paymaster in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) to authorize the appointment of Alexander D. B. Smead as a captain of cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Samuel Lindsey Graham, now on the retired list, to be commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) authorizing the President to promote Capt. James Evelyn Pilcher, United States Army, retired, to the grade of major, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petitions of Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Lodge, No. 772, and Plattsburg (N. Y.) Lodge, No. 62, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an American elk reservation in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.



By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Coshocton (Ohio) Lodge, No. 376, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for legislation creating a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Platt & Covis and E. R. Kinner, of Plainfield, Ohio, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William A. Crane, John W. Bryant, and Alexander Dice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Carriage Makers' Club, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOOHER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of William S. Thatcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLLEIGH: Petition of Mr. Ober, of Northwest Harbor, Me., for reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Adirondack Lumber Manufacturers and Shippers' Association, against reduction of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of P. V. Collins Publishing Company, of Minneapolis, Minn., for removal of the duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Society of New England Women, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring bill against misuse of the American flag for advertising purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition against any reduction of duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. V. Frye & Co., against any reduction of duty on canned sardines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Papers to accompany bill to authorize Kaw Indians in Oklahoma to bring suit in Court of Claims—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. McCutchen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Consumers' League of Wisconsin, in behalf of the Beveridge-Parsons bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Consumers' League of Wisconsin, favoring bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a children's bureau—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petitions of George Hale & Co. and Charles H. Phemig, of Kenosha, Wis., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petitions of the American Rolling Company, against any reduction greater than 20 per cent on sheet iron and steel; Dayton Grinding Wheel Company, against a duty on corundum; the Ernst Mirror Plate Company, against increase of duty on plate glass; the Rike Kumlir Company, against increase of duty on hosiery; and the Walker Lithographing and Printing Company, against reduction of tariff on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of 143 employees of Kimberly & Clark Paper Company, favoring retention of present rate of duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of John A. Feeney, of Davenport, Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Clinton, Iowa, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Hogg & Kimball, M. Clement, McClatchie & Secor, N. F. Fortun, and N. C. Berg and others, all of the State of Wisconsin, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Wisconsin, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of General Horace Porter Camp, No. 79, Division of Pennsylvania, and Sons of Veterans Camp, No. 79, favoring February 12 as a holiday in honor of Lincoln—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Marston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John F. Jelke Company, of Chicago, favoring legislation to prevent misrepresentation in sale of butters—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Illinois Farmers' Institute, etc., favoring abolition of free seeds by the Government—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Hardwood Manufacturers' Association of

the United States, against any reduction of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of citizens of Sargent and Ransom counties, N. Dak.; citizens of Stutsman, N. Dak.; 112 citizens of North Dakota; and citizens of Williams County, N. Dak., against reduction of duty on grain—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMER: Petition of Intermountain Fair Association, of Idaho, favoring a national highways commission and federal aid in construction of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of Van Buren County, Mich., urging legislation to prevent shipment of liquor into prohibition territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of many citizens from various towns in Texas, against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Eastward Wire Manufacturers' Company, of Belleville, N. J., against any radical cut in paper schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of Kauffman Brothers, Des Moines, Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. F. Chance, of Readfield, and A. J. Horton, of Woodward, Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of S. M. Thompson and other residents, Norman H. Wear and 13 other citizens, George W. Whitney and 48 other citizens, Theodore T. Richardson and 15 other citizens, Haas Brothers and 38 other citizens, George Flaxner and 69 other citizens, Mrs. L. Brown and 25 other citizens, and Arthur T. Thomas and 25 other citizens, all of San Francisco, Cal., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: Petitions of employees of Kimberly Clark Company; employees of Combined Locks Paper Company, of Appleton; employees of Marinette and Menominee Paper Company, of Marinette; employees of Wisconsin Tissue Paper Company, of Appleton; employees of Little Chute Paper Company, of Little Chute; employees of Crivits Pulp and Paper Company, of Crivits; employees of Union Bag and Paper Company, of Kaukauna; employees of Patten Paper Company, of Appleton; employees of Riverside Fiber Paper Company, of Appleton; and employees of Fox River Paper Company, of Appleton, all of the State of Wisconsin, against adoption of recommendation of special commission on paper and wood pulp investigation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petition of citizens of Savanna, Ill., opposing tax on tea or coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of H. W. Garner, of Collingswood, N. J., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred H. Egbert and Henry H. Shaw, of Haddonfield, N. J., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Walker, Baker & Co., of Chicago, against a duty on crude cocoa—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of J. M. Glass and R. F. McConnell, of Monmouth, Ill., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. D. Dffenbough, of Monmouth, Ill., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of Plattsmouth Lodge, No. 1739, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for reservation for the care of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, favoring the present tariff on lumber, wooden boxes, and shooks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of J. Aattenbach, of Deadwood, S. Dak., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Frank M. Wills and other employees in manufacture of paper and wood-pulp products, against reduction of tariff on same—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of certain citizens of Indianola, Nebr., against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PARSONS: Petitions of Schmidt & Co. and other business firms and employees in the lithographic industry of New York City, favoring higher duty on lithographic productions—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harry E. Oty, of Robinson, Ill., and sundry other citizens of Crawford County, Ill., directly interested in the oil industry as independent oil producers, farmers, landowners, etc., praying for the retention of the present countervailing duty on oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. D. Madding and over 1,000 citizens of Clark and Cumberland counties, Illinois, who are directly interested in the oil field of Illinois as farmers, independent oil producers, etc., praying for the retention of the present countervailing duty on oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Petition of legislature of the State of Illinois, against increase of duty on manufactured moving-picture films—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of W. Dependorf, of Morton Canning Company, of Morton, N. Y., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. A. Macumber, of Perry, N. Y., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STANLEY: Papers to accompany bill for relief of D. W. Higgins, heir of John W. Higgins; George W. Lackey; and Sarah E. Swindler, heir of William W. Hildreth—to the Committee on War Claims.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 23, 1909.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### THE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1438.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 1438.

Mr. MACON. Before that motion is put to the House, I would like to state that the gentleman from New York yesterday afternoon, when the committee arose, was making a most interesting speech, and while he became a little restless at some interruptions, still I suppose it was all in good nature; so that inasmuch as he is to continue that speech this morning, and it being of such great importance that he ought to have a full hearing, for that reason I am inclined to suggest that we have a quorum present, and I would like to count—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum?

Mr. MACON. If the Speaker can count a quorum in this House, I think it is one of the impossibilities. I do not think even the Speaker can count a quorum in this Hall now.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair, if the gentleman makes the point of no quorum, will put the question, and if no quorum appears, of course—

Mr. MACON. I will not make it, but I wanted the gentleman to have a full hearing; that is my reason for the suggestion.

The question was taken, and the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIEKEMA] will take the chair for to-day, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] being called home on account of sickness.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DIEKEMA in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1438.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose last night, or just previous, I had about concluded what I wanted to say about the subject of steel rails. I wish to say nothing further this morning on the subject than to put in the RECORD the

prices given by Judge Gary, president of the United States Steel Company, and the foreign prices, each country making a difference in the price as to the rails shipped for export and those consumed for domestic use.

	Export price.	Domestic price.
Germany.....	\$23.20	\$29.02
England.....	23.61	27.85
France.....	25.09	33.81
Belgium.....	23.25	27.45

If gentlemen will take these prices and take the prices of steel in this country and add \$3.94 per ton and the duty as it is left, at seven-fortieths of a cent per pound, instead of seven-twentieths of a cent per pound as it is now, or \$3.94, and add freight, they will readily see that we have left the protective duty upon steel rails upon a fair basis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two other articles in the metal schedule about which I desire to talk; one is the duty on tin plate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption before he starts on a further discussion of the bill? I want to know if the gentleman will permit of a question at this time in regard to some of the items the gentleman spoke of yesterday?

Mr. PAYNE. Does it relate to the metal schedule?

Mr. NORRIS. No, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. I propose to take the bill up this morning in a little more orderly fashion than I did yesterday, as I was led away from the subject I desired to speak on by questions that were asked me. If it is a single question, I have no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to have the gentleman give us the benefit of the information, which I suppose was given in the hearings on the question of the importation of coffee. I wanted the gentleman to give us for our information the proportionate part of the world's supply of coffee that was used by our people, and also the proportionate part of the world's supply of coffee that was supplied by Brazil, if he can give it to us.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not do that at this moment. We consume an average of about a billion pounds of coffee a year, most all of which, of course, is imported, and I do not remember so as to state with any degree of accuracy the proportion of the world's supply of coffee that amounts to; but it is a very large proportion.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I will ask the gentleman if this information appears in the hearings and can be obtained there?

Mr. PAYNE. It can be obtained, and I think in the hearings; but I am a little doubtful about that.

Mr. STERLING. When the gentleman was reading the prices of steel rails in foreign countries this morning did he read the domestic and foreign prices of American steel rails?

Mr. PAYNE. Up to two or three weeks ago the price of steel rails in the United States was \$28 a ton for domestic purposes. The price of rails sold abroad varied in different countries because of the varying tariffs. Of course, when we go into the foreign trade we have to pay the most or all of the foreign duties, and so the price abroad varied in order to meet the domestic competition in the country where the rails were sold.

Mr. STERLING. Is it generally less or greater than the price here in America?

Mr. PAYNE. Generally less.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I might suggest there that the chairman of the committee read the foreign and domestic prices of steel rails in other countries.

Mr. PAYNE. I have just read it this morning.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it would be a matter of very great convenience if the gentleman could answer this question now, but if he does not feel it the proper time to do so, of course I leave that to his judgment. This is a bill of very great importance to many of us, and very many inquiries have come in from my State since the bill has been presented to the public. Men differ upon many of the provisions of the bill. Large interests and large industries are affected. I desire to know whether there will be an opportunity to offer amendments in the House, or whether we must look elsewhere for the consideration of amendments.

Mr. PAYNE. As I said yesterday, that is entirely in the judgment of the House and in their control. All I am seeking to do at this present moment is what seems to be an impossible task, to conclude this speech that I am trying to make.